272.05 W-86 42065

Woodstock Letters

Vol 97 (1968)

272.05 W-86 42065

MEM. MEMORIAL
MO. PROV. S. J.
3700 W. PINE
ST. LOUIS, MO.

272.05
W-86

DATE DUE

MAR 27	1		
GAYLORD			PRINTED IN U.S.A.

WOODSTOCK LETTERS

FALL 1968

VOLUME 97 NUMBER 4

CONTENTS

FALL 1968

GUSTAVE WEIGEL MEMORIAL ISSUE

429 INTRODUCTION

430 THE EARLY YEARS

431 A Pedagogic Reminiscence

435 The Arm and the Hammer

437 Long Retreat Journal: Tertianship, 1934

449 PREACHING THE WORD

449 Early Sermon: Blessed Are They Who Have Not Seen

451 Santiago Memorial Sermon for Franklin D. Roosevelt

456 THOUGHTS ON LATIN AMERICA

457 Chile: 1938 and After

462 Letter to Ambassador to Argentina

468 The American Citizen's Obligation to South America

476 The Latin Dimension of the Americas

484 THE NATURE OF THE CHURCH

485 Missions and Ecclesiology

492 The Role of the Layman in the Church

505 Current Ecclesiology and Canonist Ecclesiology Compared

517 THE INTELLECTUAL LIFE
518 The University in Time
525 The Catholic Woman and the Intellectual Life
535 Accepting the Universe

540 CHURCH AND STATE
541 Pluralism and Theology
552 The Responsibility of Religion for the Social Order

555 ECUMENISM
556 Sermon: Unity Octave, 1960
560 Modern Protestant Theological Positions

568 RELIGION AND INVOLVEMENT IN SOCIETY
569 Left and Right
575 Our Religious Crisis
577 What Makes a Prophet a Prophet?

590 LETTERS TO SR. JEREMY

597 VATICAN COUNCIL
598 Diary
602 Letters to Woodstock

604 MAN FOR OTHERS: REFLECTIONS ON GUSTAVE WEIGEL • *Walter J. Burghardt, S.J.*

FOR CONTRIBUTORS

WOODSTOCK LETTERS solicits manuscripts from all Jesuits on all topics of particular interest to fellow Jesuits: Ignatian spirituality, the activities of our various apostolates, problems facing the modern Society, and the history of the Society, particularly in the United States and its missions. In general it is our policy to publish major obituary articles on men whose work would be of interest to the whole assistancy.

Letters of comment and criticism will be welcomed for the Readers' Forum.

Manuscripts, preferably the original copy, should be double-spaced with ample margins. Whenever possible, contributors of articles on Ignatian spirituality and Jesuit history should follow the stylistic norms of the Institute of Jesuit Sources. These are most conveniently found in Supplementary Notes B and C and in the list of abbreviations in Joseph de Guibert, S.J., *The Jesuits: Their Spiritual Doctrine and Practice*, trans. W. J. Young (Chicago, 1964), pp. 609–16.

STAFF

Published by the faculty and students of Woodstock College. *Editor*: Edward J. Mally, S. J./*Managing Editor*: Gerard C. Reedy, S. J./*Copy Editor*: Richard A. Blake, S. J./*Associate Editors*: Robert C. Collins, S. J., James P. Jurich, S. J., Raymond A. Schroth, S. J., R. Emmett Curran, S. J., Kenneth J. DeLuca, S. J., Edward T. Dowling, S. J., Peter D. Fordi, S. J., Patrick H. Samway, S. J., James F. Donnelly, S. J., Richard R. Galligan, S. J., Joseph J. Papaj, S. J./*Business Manager*: Paul L. Horgan, S. J.

Introduction

This issue of Woodstock Letters commemorates the fifth anniversary of the death of Gustave Weigel, S.J., Jesuit priest, teacher, scholar and ecumenist. The heretofore unpublished selections in this issue, however, reveal more of the human Weigel than the scholarly; their main purpose is to revive Fr. Weigel in the minds of his friends, old and new.

This issue also commemorates the centennial of Woodstock College. It is fitting that the names of Gustave Weigel and Woodstock College be once more together. For the reputation the institution has today is in no small part owing to the advance work of Fr. Weigel and his great friend, John Courtney Murray, S.J., in the 1940's and 1950's. In the two decades of theological excitement which culminated in the Second Vatican Council, these two men were everywhere on the American scene, opening the doors of the Church of Rome.

Thanks for this issue must go to **Walter J. Burghardt, S.J.** professor of Patristics at Woodstock College and editor-in-chief of *Theological Studies*, for his afterword and for editorial advice and help; to **Richard A. Blake, S.J.**, a student at Woodstock and an editor of Woodstock Letters, for editing the tertianship diary; and especially to **R. Emmett Curran, S.J.**, archivist at Woodstock College, for assembling, editing, and introducing all the selections. More than any man, Fr. Curran has made this issue possible.

For the future researcher: the spelling and grammar of the following selections have been standardized; a few confusing expressions have also been rewritten. Omission of more than a few words has always been noted with suspension dots. "Long Retreat Journal," "Thoughts on Latin America," the Vatican II diary and the tributes from Fr. Weigel's friends have been especially heavily edited for a variety of personal and editorial reasons. Subheads are, of course, the editor's. The original text of any of these selections is available in the archives of Woodstock College, Woodstock, Maryland, 21163.

G. C. R.

THE EARLY YEARS

"Poor and hurried," commented Gus Weigel's junior English teacher in 1920 at Canisius High in Buffalo about a composition Gus had written on his interests in writing. The comments grew more and more favorable as the year progressed, but even at this early stage Gus excelled more as a public speaker and debater than he did as a writer. To the end of his life he would be at his best in the oral situation. Most of his later books and articles, in fact, grew out of lectures or addresses which he would revise for publication.

But Gus Weigel began to write early and he continued to write after he entered the Society of Jesus in 1922. Sermons on Jesuit saints, Latin and Greek poetry, debate speeches on the value of electives in high school, philosophical dissertations on Aquinas and Augustine—all came from his pen in the first seven years in the Society.

In 1929 Mr. Weigel taught Freshman English and Latin at Loyola College in Baltimore. It was a glorious year for Gus Weigel, one in which he discovered the power and lure of teaching. He has left a poignant account of that year and its aftermath. Scribbled at the close of the account was a note explaining that the article should be published under the pseudonym of Austin Kiefer or Cooper. Kiefer was his mother's maiden name and its English version, Cooper, was actually used by Weigel in several articles published in America *and elsewhere in the early forties.*

Gus Weigel wrote very little poetry after his initial Latin and Greek pieces. "The Arm and the Hammer," dating most probably from his years of theological studies at Woodstock in the early thirties, reflects the first stirrings of the restless spirit that would refuse to accept things as they were. This spirit also stirs in a journal of his tertianship days, that year of intensive prayer and pastoral service which every Jesuit undergoes at the close of his training.

A Pedagogic Reminiscence

It had been his first year in the class-room. It was a small college and he lectured to freshmen. He soon was heart and soul in his work. The young collegians grew fond of him and he worshipped them. He identified himself with his class so thoroughly that their successes and failures in any field, scholastic or athletic, collegiate or private, caused more intense reactions in him than in them. His education limited to the academic plane of long schooling, was narrow but deep, and rich in ideas. The young men, enthused by his enthusiasm, and full of their own spirit of practical activity, carried out his schemes. It was an easy combination—a bookish but fervid idealist, and a plastic but energetic group. The year was a happy one and all forms of splendicent splurges were successfully manoeuvred. The students were stimulated and Don Quixote was weary but eminently satisfied.

The year was over. Friends suggested that the young mentor do a few more years of postgraduate work in order to improve his opportunities. The ideal was alluring. Books were always enticing —and besides a distant vision was repulsive, the vision of returning to an instructor's desk to face fifty or sixty strangers while his former pupils were under other tutors. Hence he followed the given suggestion and was enrolled in a nearby university.

Then silent troubles began. He no sooner left his little college, than he found he could not leave it. He brought it with him. He went to vacation only to find usual activities dismal and flat. The experiences of his friends could not interest him. Physical exercise seemed meaningless and futile. A dynamizing force had suddenly dropped out of his life and he stood inert and stiff. The psychic forces that used to flow out into receptive channels now welled up within him, and grew stagnant and oppressive. Nothing but an irritating restlessness resulted. He was too proud to admit his dependance on his pupils and forebade any one of them to see him on his last return. He came back, packed, settled his affairs and saw none of them but two—one who had taken ill, and the other who had promised to motor him to his new abode.

Now the past became absolute. The young men whose advancement in experience and wisdom had been his constant engagement for ten intense months were now definitely catalogued as a memory.

That is exactly what they were not. Memory formally implies the past. An amputated arm is more than a memory. It is a loss in the present. The loss is more acute if the armless one's previous activities were entirely scoped around the discarded member. Readjustment is painful because it constantly recalls a desiderated something. Here precisely was the young teacher's difficulty. He had not so much worked for his men. He had worked with them.

For distraction's sake—and to retaste a teacher's life—he conducted a language class at a summer school. The result was gloomy. The class was entirely composed of professional students who studied a new tongue for greater proficiency in their respective sciences. Between teacher and class there was no continuity. Each student looked at the instructor much as a motorist looks at a signpost—as a source of impersonal direction. This was as it should be. But for our young enthusiast, teaching meant something else. This was not an instructor's work as he conceived it. This was drudgery. Impersonality on the one side induced impersonality on the other—and the final grades submitted to the Dean were inhuman.

Fall came and with it a new semester and new teachers—in university and college. The instructor looked before and after and sighed for what was not. He cheered himself with the dubious proposition that intense work is the universal anodyne. New ideas, novel aspects, untried methods were being presented. But a university professor doesn't lecture—he drones or talks staccato. (Visions of restless young men, unwelcome buzzing, senseless questions, eager wills and receptive minds.) University professors talk of Rousseau, of Pestalozzi, of Herbart. Who cares? (Memories of a power and a response more invigorating than all the theories from Aristotle to Dewey!)

Memory is a deceitful mirror. It is highly idealistic—it heightens and selects its details. In consequence, reality seen face to face can frequently produce unwelcome shocks. Our doubtful hero found reason to return to the old camping ground. To his chagrin and amazement, he found himself an unwelcome ghost! The dead may be mourned—but they are expected to stay dead.

The lesson learned

The ex-teacher returned to his books gladly and swore a mighty oath never to be seen in the old haunts and by the old faces. He

might as well have sworn to breathe no air. His fond memories were shaken but not shattered. Shattering is a more gradual process. There was still contact with the idolized class. For in all truth the class missed the former teacher and still held him in esteem. But a teacher is only one small element in a student's life. He has home, the girl across the street, local interests, athletics, a hobby, and frequently after-school employment. In comparison with some of these the teacher is insignificant. The teacher rarely thinks of this. He—especially if he be single—has only one preoccupation, his class. He envisages class matter concretely with relations to his students; he plans his daily order with reference to his class; he makes most of his human contacts in or through his pupils. The young men confide in him—much like the heroine in the fairy tale confided in the old iron stove. The young men may even form friendships with their instructors, but the basis of affection is weak. The pupil by right and by instinct expects to be helped by his teacher. That is why he goes to school. The teacher is fundamentally a useful thing. Hence any union formed with teachers is chiefly selfish in its aims. Affection is not absent but it is an affection that never wholly rises above the egocentric plane. Between the instructor and the student there is an impassable wall of position and age. You can talk through it; you can act as if it were not there, but it stands adamant forever. If the teacher's voice does not carry, the student soon forgets that he exists.

All this our young instructor learned as his communication with his pupils grew thinner and thinner. It was a long drawn out disillusionment and it hurt. But it brought with it humility and truth. The young pedagog now studies Pestalozzi and Herbart with isolated preoccupation. He still thinks of his "boys"—and prays for them. When he meets them, it gives them both pleasure. But the old control they had over him is going fast; it is almost gone.

Has he given up the idea of a teacher's profession? Not at all; that would be cowardice, pessimism, and surrender—all impossible to an idealist. He has merely orientated himself aright. He now knows that in the pupil's life he is *an* influence but not *the* influence. He now knows that he must pass out of the student's life as inevitably as death. Therefore while he has the student, while his power on him is strong, he must drop into the pupil's life a seed

that will grow in the future without personal attention. That seed is the love of the right, the love of beauty, the love of God. In other words he must become a religious teacher whether he wears the cloth or not.

If this seed is implanted in the youth, the future of the boy and the future of the instructor may be widely disparate and diverse. Yet the teacher will be satisfied and his work will be rich in fruit. His reward will be in eternity where he will be united with his many classes, all linked through him around the great Beauty and the great Truth. The teacher can have no other real reward. If he cannot understand or relish this one, he had better choose another calling. For if he continues to teach but seeks some different recompense, he will either prostitute the greatest of professions, or he will ruin his life and lose, perhaps, his soul.

* * *

Fr. Weigel made a most important contribution in this country to what has now become an amazing movement of transformation in the Catholic Church, which should be an example to Protestants. But when all these things are said, it is the vital faith and the loving spirit of Gus Weigel for which we are grateful to God.

JOHN C. BENNETT
President, Union
Theological Seminary

The Arm and the Hammer

To WAIT or to strike;
That is the riddle.
To wait is man's duty
So often.
The Prisoner
And the Victim of a System
Must wait
And too long.

Waiting is in place
Often when striking is luring.
But waiting too long
Or too often
Kills in Man
The soul to strike.

A System Piles
Waiting on men,
To kill the soul to strike.
For the striking urge
Is dangerous to Systems.

A System works only
By directing
Mass inertias.
Self-movements
Cannot be controlled
And a heap of self-movements
Soon refuses to be a heap.

No man knows the value
Of his stroke.
Many a man can lose it
To humanity's gain.
But he who links himself
To System

Must know
That his striking arm
Will wither or be broken.
The System can only use
His Mass,
Not his thrust.

Sad is he
Who has not lost his striking arm
Nor the heart to use it
And yet is System-bound.

Sometimes he strikes
And crushes himself
Under the weight
Of the System
Which his movement
Started down
Upon him.

Sometimes he strikes
And laughs to see
The Sparks
His stroke brought forth.
And he is not crushed.
For he is but loosely linked
To the System.

He lives parasitically
On the whole
And the whole
Leaves him alone
For he is in it
But not of it.
He has grown big
By it.
But he never grew
Into it.

Long Retreat Journal: Tertianship, 1934

In this book which is so far the story of sad failure and hopeless lack of proper idealization and motives, I shall write my retreat experiences. . . .

SEPTEMBER 30, 1934

. . . For me to meditate on God and myself is easy. I like it. The majesty of God and the yearning that the Supernatural makes possible are all very dear. As I conceived the soul enveloped and absorbed in the great warm darkness that is God, I was frightened at the thought that this was the "back-to-the-womb" urge of psychology. . . . What of it? Has not the "back-to-the-womb" urge its fulfillment in the Supernatural? Is not supernaturalized man's subconscious crying for what the psychiatrist thinks is interior but really much deeper, fuller, and fullest being? . . . I am making the Exercises on the basis that they leave the soul in freedom. . . . I use my own ideas in these meditations. Even Examen I do my own way. This is not pride or selfishness. I know that the ways taught me years ago are impossible. I shall trust the Spirit.

OCTOBER 1

Now the trouble with "tantum-quantum" is that *free will by itself* has *no power* to make any selection in accord with that end. Hence, Ignatius' remark is either Semipelagian or merely idealistic, presupposing grace, which is presupposing everything. . . . The Foundation which is an intellectual charter of surrender is consequently a real declaration of independence. . . . My peace is unperturbed. I owe this to the prayers of my friends. . . . How different all is from the novitiate—with its lack of candor and incapacity, spiritual, mental, and moral to do the thing. . . . Like a true maniac, he was beyond doubt—and I almost wish I were.

OCTOBER 2

This is really the third. The second was quite interesting. I wrote out my rough draft for the general confession. This took most of the free time. Consequently, the diary was left alone.

OCTOBER 3

I worked all day on the confession and I finished it. It is a dread thing to have it around. . . . I must say I like P. Lutz' retreat. It is gentle. He takes care not to rouse sleeping dogs. He is orthodox, straight-forward, without flourish. This wine and women thing today was so typical. The day was devoted to hell. It is interesting how even here the Instructor deems it necessary to *prove* the existence of hell. Certainly, the picture of Ign. does not help faith. It is a rank anthropomorphic phantasma of a theory we cannot comprehend. There is fear to be installed but the Ign. med. is too much like a child's bogey man. I notice P. Lutz stays away from the points—or apologizes for them.

OCTOBER 4

This is a rather eventful day. It could be the starting point of something new and great. However, taught by the past, I make no promises. This is a day that proves that God is behind the Exercises or that there is more psychology to be studied in them than first appearances would indicate. The latter solution is not enticing. Psychologically the Exercises are not aptly planned—5 hours of med.; 1¼ hours points; ¾ hours Mass; ½ hour of Examen; Vespers ½ hour. Spiritual reading and conference. We already have at least 9 hours. A priest must add an hour's office.

We do not fully follow this, but have the strain of external regimentation to face.

When one sees this line up and realizes the subject matter is either dismal introspection or idealistic projections of phantasmata —either difficult on the mind—a psychiatrist would throw up his hands. Yet there is a sustaining force for the exercitant. . . . Death I can see only as a passing through heavy, high, dark, thick, silent hangings. I would not care to go through them, not for fear of the other side, but because I feel that there are some things still to be done on this side. . . . Then came the words which have been in my head since the retreat started: "Rise, clasp my hand and

come." I did. With that hand I shall walk the yielding waters of the future. . . . The wreck of the past must be a chrysalis. Call it hysteria, an experience of God, holy tears. I cannot give a name—but it was very gripping. . . .

OCTOBER 5

It was the day of the Kingdom. I do not like the conquistador of Ignatius. I think he ought to be ashamed of himself. Cervantes laughed off all that sort of thing. . . .

OCTOBER 6

An interesting day. Rainy except for a dark late afternoon with a delightful sunburst just before sunset. . . .

I worked out on the points sheets some ideas. In the light of those perhaps these remarks make sense. The Logos so loved me—man—either is as true and both melt into one—that he did what I must do so that I can love him—*exinanitio*. The Incarnation—the *adventus amantis*—is the *kenosis* which is the *radix* of all. He surrenders his divinity to bind me with the cords of Adam and entice me to surrender my humanity. It was the exchange of gifts—but he is the dominant in this love and consequently leads the way. This primal *kenosis* is an act of the divinity, so my *kenosis*—his went putting on the human and putting off the divine; mine, *e contrario*, must be done by the divine Triad, but it needs consent, willingness, readiness.

In both *kenoses* there is no real stripping. God cannot but be God; man can be divinized but he is still man. But in both cases there is an expansion. . . . "Rise, clasp my hand and come. Look, I have made the seeming annihilation. It is nothing. It is the way to something better—you and I one. Come, tarry not, I yearn. Come, put off your seeming self; be yourself; be me!"

That is the Incarnation. The soul still in doubt; in perplexity; sees glimmers and asks, "How can this be done?" The answer is simple: watch the initial *exinanitio* flower all along the stem of its growth. Remember the *kenosis* is positive not negative.

1) *Nativity*. . . . [Christ] rejects the idea that peace can only be had through pomp, comfort, and wealth. . . . Suffering, therefore, is not incompatible with peace. It is not however to be chosen on that account. It still needs value. That later.

2) *Circumcision and Presentation:* Religion and religious forms are now dealt with. In the arms of Mary, the perfect channel of the divinity to humanity, leading his life, thinking his thought, brings him to go through the ceremonies. That is *all* they were. Yet Christ considers them worthwhile, be the priests as sterile as their stiff vestments. In the forms, God ordained, God and Christ can be found in those who watch for his coming. . . . The human fittingly encircles the divine so that the humanity will at least appreciate God in its own way. Forms have value—even dead forms. Note, too, that before "religious experience" was possible, "organized and ritualistic religion" is chosen. . . .

OCTOBER 7

Something is wrong. I can schematize my way clearly into the Christ-life. I can "see" certain lessons he is teaching. But I still want *kudos*. In other words, I do not see that Christ is better; I am not ready for surrender. It is no use to say, "No, I don't want it." That is untrue; I do want it; saying the opposite isn't going to change that. I need a powerful vision of the truth. It is not enough to see him doing things that show where the truth must be. I must see the truth! I can already see the "betterness" of the unselfish position in terms of logic—I cannot make the assent. I do not see—I do not see, the truth will make me free—but I must see it. Truth can give vision; I am not so foolish as to ask for an intellectual natural perception. "Volo dissolvi et esse cum Christo"—I want to say that. I have enough vision to see that is right. I can't say it. The *volo* is *vellem*. I have not enough vision to see the rightness. What can give me to see what I want to see? It is not the study of Christ's life—useful though that may be. Christ's life as a lesson needs the initial vision—he alone counts. I suppose I must pray and have others intercede for me. . . .

OCTOBER 8

This was the break-day. There is all the difference between a noviceship break and now. I spent the earlier part of the day looking for a book . . . I did not find it. I then went to John Murray's room. He has a bad cold. We talked and exchanged ideas and experiences. As usual, we agree. . . . (with John I had spent almost all the time in spiritual conversation—but not, God help us, the "novicey" kind.)

After rec. I said some office, for I was behind. I also got Teresa's "autobiography"—that is break-day—quiet, serene, dull.

OCTOBER 9

And Christ now begins to make disciples. Note that he is anxious to win many. However, unlike yours truly, he wants to make them *him*, not *his*. This must be the key to my work—make, then share and expand my Christ-life—not serve and enhance my ambitions and love of power. . . .

OCTOBER 10

I am delighted with the autobiography of St. Teresa. She is beyond doubt a remarkable woman. I find great help and much information from her struggles with prayer, which ended simply in surrender not to self but to the Beloved. She considers Ignatian meditation as a good thing in want of something better. Intellectual prayer, though often easier, is not even as good as prayer of the will. She is certainly an out and out Bannezian. She recommends Ignatian prayer as a safe and profitable introduction for people with lively intelligence. I should study her carefully—but not now. As it is I spend too much time on her. . . . The Pharisees and religious leaders could not abide [Christ]. They resented his pointing out their faults; they did not like his different attitude to God because they saw it as a repudiation of theirs. Orthodoxy was their monopoly. . . . They were men of the letter, of the "approved doctrine," of abomination of difference, of pushing the interests of their party at all costs. . . . No wonder they hated Christ and his freedom of spirit, his love of man, his sympathy, his sublime contempt for two by four plans for a silly and ludicrous perfection which was a theological dialectic product.

OCTOBER 11

. . . This day has been difficult and full of the smoke of the Prince of Babylon. I am told that the Prince of Peace will make me an "organization man." I do not wish to be an "organization man." I would much rather run on a progressive ticket. I do not wish to be an independent but the organization looks too much like a spiritual Tammany to suit me. Now I am wrong here or it is wrong to say that I cannot be a good Jesuit unless I accept the yoke of conformity. I have no objection to conformity. I object to com-

mitting myself to conformity, regardless of the matter of conformity. I commit myself to the truth as I see it. Often that will not be as the "orthodox" see it. That does not make me wrong. The "orthodox" are so in name only. I even believe the principle they work on is unorthodox. Now must I say farewell to this attitude of mind? Should I trust the adopted intuition of one or a few men in preference to my own? The fact that many follow gives it no weight. They follow on principle and without criticism. Hence, *a priori*, it has no claim on the truth *per se*. *A posteriori*, we find it wrong so often. Witness the General's *Instructio*. His doctrine, the orthodox doctrine, was "unorthodox" only a month ago![1]

I am willing to follow them but not merely to follow them. I refuse to be extra poundage to make the machine go. I'll give my poundage to the truth. I obey all commands, but my intellection and methods are subject to vision and not decree. If this be treason, do thou, Christ, convict me! I am ready to follow *thee* anywhere. . . . P. Lutz told us to confer the *Informationes* on *promotio ad gradum*. This was our mirror of perfection. That idea bothered me in every way. . . .

OCTOBER 12

The exam results still bother me, but they are better controlled.[2] I wonder when we shall find out. . . . I am constantly looking for signs.

I have been reading St. Teresa. Her attitude to prayer is different from that of St. Ignatius—or is it? There is a wider range to her views. She is less straitening. She makes it seem sweeter. She omits the gestures necessary. She says she simply could not do what Ignatius considers essential to his meditations—the use of the

---

[1] On August 15, 1934, Father General, Wlodimir Ledochowski, issued an "Instruction of Schools and Universities," in which he stressed professional involvement for those in the educational apostolate. Fr. Weigel does not explicitate this observation in any of his journals, but this seems to be the only formal "Instructio" promulgated around this time.

[2] It was the custom to reveal the results of the "ad grad," the comprehensive examination in all of theology and philosophy, taken at the end of the fourth year of theology, to the tertian fathers during their long retreat. The results of this examination were often used to determine a priest's admission to solemn or simple final vows, and even his future rôle in the Society.

intellect. She does really use it though! However, I had better stick to Ignatius. I am so fearful of my own judgment in these matters.

OCTOBER 14

Pride and vanity are very silly and dangerous agitations of the soul.

St. Teresa grows better and better. If only faith were a little stronger. I have not yet met Christ intimately. Unfortunately, faith requires and is produced by the same thing—deep intensive prayer. Mutual causality. . . . I flee distraction, which is the one thing I really want. . . . Litanies are as barren and sterile as ever. The novices are taking a beating, but look none the worse for it. He talks to them sometimes over an hour. Prayer is evidently still difficult.

The juniors are stupid! As table-servers they are flat failures; as Mass servers they are worse than the Grand Street boys. I hope they are good students. Piety is the glow of an efficient lamp—not the dull glimmers—red and hectic—of a dim carbon.

I am unfair—or am I? Certainly, my feet are too much on earth at present!

OCTOBER 15

. . . The conferences were on the laws of Election. P. Lutz says they are a masterpiece. I think they are "bunk." Either they are what they obviously seem—the normal attack on the problem at hand—or they have a hidden meaning, which has escaped everybody. In either case they are useless, except as a reminder of what the sane mind does. However, on the med. sheets I indicated the resolutions I make, i.e., the dispositions I am praying for. Prayer is what I need. I must also watch relaxation—let-up in work and seeking recreation. . . . One thing is clear. Ignatius scoped his Exercises about the Election. All is planned so that the right attitude attacks the issue, that the answer which reason, enlightened by faith and some Christian enthusiasm (growing love), dictates, be accepted, that the Election be firmly adhered to in the future.

They have switched from Stewart Rose's *Ignatius* to Meschler's *The Humanity of Christ*. Meschler is the conservative Jesuit at his best. There is a certain cold non-illuminating gleam to him—no great warmth and absolutely no inspiration. He systematized our

Principles, justified them and worked them out quite nicely. He is P. Lutz without snuff!

OCTOBER 16

There is no doubt about it. The Joannine Christ teaches the people concerning the reign of *hamartia*, liberation through filiation, worthlessness of works except in union with Christ; the death of legalism and the external urge for perfection, love and light. . . .

OCTOBER 17

This was the second break-day. It was interesting in many respects. John Murray asked me for a walk. . . . John and I talked again. I told him I had slept so poorly and the reason: P. Lutz had announced that the *specula* were for sale.[3] I had resolved to leave mine until the Third Week. . . . No matter what the news was, the retreat would suffer. Wisely, John counselled the contrary.

OCTOBER 18

. . . True to John's advice and for my own peace of soul, I sought the verdict. It was, of course, favorable. The *speculum* was inoffensive. I have no idea who drew it up. I daresay P. McCormick could have—it shows his insight into the dogmatism problem.

Now this order of time business:—P. Lutz has no scruple to talk to me at any time. The *speculum* came up during Examen. Therefore, what? When I got back to my room, I felt like weeping over my excessive smallness. . . . This compunction was the surest sign of the sinfulness of my previous state of mind. . . . What do the "traditionalists" stand for? What is there that gives them inspiration? They are wedded hopelessly to an uncritical epistemology which gives them the world of seeming. Hence, free will, individuation, and "common-sense" are absolutes for them. Thought-forms, vision, immanent urges, and values are to them delusions, dangerous because traitorous to their "real" world. There is the trouble—we are loyal to the *real*. The difficulty arises on the question—what is real and how does one reach it?

---

[3] The *speculum* was a written character assessment, culled from former superiors and theology professors, and read to the tertian during his long retreat.

OCTOBER 19

. . . More talk. From the sound of all this one would think I had the break-day which the novices had. Ah, those poor kids! I am so sorry for them. Imagine, beginning the whole thing all over again!

In the afternoon med. we dealt with the Temple talks of Christ. I cannot get over the idea that the priests in general and Jesuit *primores* are all capable of taking to heart what Christ told the Scribes and Pharisees. So much of what the Scribes and Pharisees stood for is again current in our day. I suppose this is a movement from the Evil Spirit. . . .

OCTOBER 20

In line with the Eucharist I drew into rapid congeries my views on that lovely mystery. I wrote through most of P. Lutz' conference on the Rules for Alms. . . .

The absolute helplessness of the will to obey the law never bothers them. They speak of grace and picture it as an oil that takes out the creaks of a well-running machine. P. Lutz does a little better. He says the union is more than moral—but it is a mysterious indefinable union with the mysterious Trinity. True enough, but what about the Eucharist? Is it what it sacramentally is or is it not? Do I or don't I eat Christ? If I do, then I unite with him! I unite with him primarily as man—one cannot eat a spirit. In this, union is given, and perfected the union with the Trinity—grace—for the man Christ is God—De La Taille.

. . . Love is not the observance of the commandments or the fruit of such observance; the observance is the fruit of love. Read John! This is not mysticism. This is simple "theology with some poetry"—P. Lutz.

Christianity is too much concerned in our day by a non-intelligent cultus of the Eucharist which has as its proof our empty Masses when Law does not enter. Yet the Eucharist is the center and beginning of all our religious life. It is still the "hard word" as it was in Genesareth. They simply refuse to see how it is possible for Christ to be eaten! They cannot take the consequences. . . . Is this not my vaulting pride? Should I not follow P. Lutz? I think not. All that I know and all that gives me confidence in Christ and the Church clearly show me that P. Lutz' vision of the Church and Christ is defective. I follow Christ and the Church. These have

given P. Lutz no authority over my vision in faith. He cannot declare me wrong or right. As a learned man he is deficient in my humble opinion. Hence, over my intellect and its faith he has no authority either human or divine. I owe him authority, which I vowed; my obedience is illuminated by faith. It does not and cannot include in its scope the very light that makes it possible. God and his Christ speak to me as urgently through my grace-strengthened intellect as they do through . . . man. My talents, my time, my interests are his to dispose. My intellect, which is my life, is only God's and Christ's. I cannot surrender them—they are not mine.

OCTOBER 22

This retreat is getting long. I am counting days and that is a bad sign. I am glad that I did not succumb before this.

OCTOBER 23

Today had no more verve than yesterday. I see more clearly my original vision but it imparts no warmth. It still is the logical scheme. If I had but my eyes opened as I did in Woodstock the night I read De La Taille.

In the meditations there is impatience and a pressing of the soul and brain to squeeze out the desired sentiments. They are both dry. St. Teresa must see that and get water. Her four ways intrigue me. . . .

OCTOBER 24

. . . One dear thought I got and shall treasure—my devotion to Christ is the devotion to the Sacred Heart and I did not know it. Perhaps Mother Mary will be "discovered" like that one of these days. . . . With that I close the third week—my mind restless, sad, weepy about a confused image. . . . Christ protect us all.

OCTOBER 25

. . . To knock one's head against a stone wall is futile. It is wiser to climb over it. Ultimately, the wall must decay—it is the law of walls.

OCTOBER 26

And so we are in the fourth week. I was not interested in the

points. I am afraid that this little pig is going to market. At any rate, I am far from here. My docility to P. Lutz—who is kinder than ever—has about given out.

Then came the voice from heaven. When I was shattering silence into ten thousand shivering bits, someone left a letter from P. McCormick in my room. It was so full of spiritual warmth that I felt sorry for my waning enthusiasm and promised once more to go on.

I didn't altogether. I am reading Belloc, who is hardly the proper author. I shall give him up and go back to Teresa. . . . I am so far from Christ and God. My pride wells up within me. Failures, adverse criticisms, childhood embarrassing faux-pas . . . can make my intention shrink, shudder, squirm with a wave of withering shame, chagrin, humiliation. Suicide is the only solution that such an experience suggests. That betrays the spirit from which it arises. Love bears all; love is willing to be crushed but not to escape. I long for a breaking through the thin barrier that separates me from him. This again is pride and self. Faith is enough! God knows I do not even deserve that! I am at the present moment very desolate—alone, so alone, and miserable. . . .

OCTOBER 27

. . . The last effusion under yesterday is really the experience of today. . . . My soul does not rise. It clings to nothing but self. St. Teresa says that we must be patient and let Christ do his work in his own way and in his own time. Let us hope—and *pray.*

OCTOBER 28

Tomorrow is the last day. I am glad. It has been a holy time. Much light and much grace have come. However, I pray with such little relish that days and days of prayer are burdensome. It is a rather sad state, but it is what is. . . . I wish I were many places—escape. Restlessness, loathing of embarrassments of the past—trifles, but they vex me. Silly, sensitive, resentful and unforgetting and unforgiving. Strange mixture—lion and swine. . . .

It was good to hear P. Lutz give points on the Ascension. He conceived the Church under the Body figure—admitted physical union—scil., grace union. He struck the life note and I was pleased. I need not fear. My vision is not wrong. . . .

OCTOBER 29: LAST DAY OF RETREAT

Let us get rid of some statistics:

Retreat meditations	108	
Points given	95	
Extra-retreat meds.	3	(break-days)
Conferences	17	
Confessions made	5	
Confessions heard	4	
Midnight meds.	2	

108th med. was made on the morning of the coming out day.

These figures are most probably correct. To verify them absolutely this book will suffice.

I leave the retreat with the spirit that characterized the colloquy of the last meditation—an exuberant, flowing, energetic protest of being true to the Christ-life within me. I see difficulties, I hope however that Christ will make issue with them. I must not fail in prayer. Here is the crux. The latter part of the retreat was not as rich in religious experiences as the first. Yet what was given was enough. . . . I have learned myself. I see what I am and I see what I need. . . . I want him to take me and transform me. I am willing to surrender all. . . . I shall "arise, clasp his hand and come." I am what I am and Christ knows it.

As is clear I have courage—but not of myself. I leave with head erect because the Head is above the clouds and from it I have all power, all knowledge and all love. I do not relish the martyrdom that I know is coming but in him I can stand it. Those lines terrify me. I wrote them at the dictates of the inside. What they mean I know not. God's will be done and through Christ I accept the whole future to fill up what is wanting. This is my surrender. Oh, may I not be proved an "indian-giver"!

Tomorrow we go down from the mountain. I regret it as I write this. It is good for us to be here—and yet we must build tents elsewhere. . . . To the Great Father of Lights my heartfelt thanks for the wonders that were done me. I ask his pardon for my selfishness. With Christ, I offer all to him. A.M.D.G.—L.D.S.M.

PREACHING THE WORD

To one who loved the human word so deeply, homiletics came as a welcome calling. Remarkably, there were few congregations his words failed to reach, whether Americans, Chileans, ministers, lawyers, diplomats, or fellow Jesuits. The first sermon printed here was given in upper New York State during his tertianship year. The memorial sermon on Roosevelt was given to the American colony in Santiago at the request of Claude Bowers, U.S. Ambassador to Chile.

Early Sermon: Blessed Are They Who Have Not Seen

If you saw a man walking along the street with an umbrella up on a perfectly clear day, you would be surprised. You might even inform him that there is no rain, but your surprise would even be greater if the person told you that he believed you and was quite willing to agree that there was no rain. The surprise would be in place because there is no reasonable way of explaining his action.

Yet something like that is the usual way of acting of so many in the Church. They believe all that Christ has taught. More, they believe it just because he said so. But somehow their actions belie their faith. Their lives are the lives of those who do not know Christ; the lives of those who are merely men and not sons of God and brothers of the Savior. They act like pagans in all their dealing with men. They work hard and slave for the goods of earth as if they were the be all and end all of this life. Their thoughts are of the earth and of earthy problems. Their plans never take into consideration that we are living the life of Christ. Even their religion takes on the dress of some thriving organization. They go to their duties precisely as they attend other duties—something that must

be done and done with decency. There is life lacking. The gospel does not make new men of them. They have not become absorbed in the truth of the Christian message and they wear it like they wear a Sunday suit. It comes on and off as needed. It is not part of them. It does not transform their lives and put their heads in heaven while their feet walk the earth. They do not think in terms of Christ. They never realize that they must act always just as Christ acts. Faith is dead. It is not thriving.

We need a jolt just as Thomas needed a jolt. Thomas was not a bad man but on the contrary he loved Christ dearly. It was sadness more than anything else that made him refuse to believe. He was jolted into firm and living belief by feeling and touching the living Christ. There is the only way we can hope to rouse our faith. We must lay hold on the living Christ. How can this be done?

Christ is alive in our day. He lives in all who become one with him in Communion. The whole Church in consequence is one huge mystical Body of Christ. But we must see Christ. We must see his actions and his work going on in this strange Mystical Body of his. We must feel the throb of his life by drinking deep of this life at its earthly source, the table of the Lord. We must feel the beating of his heart by sharing his love for all men, a love that drives the lover to suffer for men, to suffer unto death and crucifixion. We must think his thoughts and share his thoughts as he looks out on life and time.

This means prayer. This means sacrifice. This means frequent attendance at the center of Christ's activity on earth—the Mass. It means study of the mind of Christ in books and in papers. But oh, the marvellous return. With Thomas we can fall down and cry "My Lord and my God". That was not a cry of humiliation, of surrender. It was a cry of marvel and admiration. He found the pearl of great price and his spirit exulted on finding a new world to take the place of the dreary world where he had been dwelling in sadness since the day of the crucifixion. From that day forth it was a new Thomas that walked the ways of the world. He walked with vigor and tireless confidence because he had touched the Christ. He had put his hand over his heart. He felt the heart that was yearning to shed glory on the name of God and to do good for all men—good even for those who hated them. That life which surged through his

fingers that day never left him. It possessed him always and drove to the shores of India where he would lose his life but gain Christ's by dying for him and for me.

Something of that fire is what we need. Live the faith that is in you. If your faith is the greatest thing on earth, then you by living it will become not John Jones with all the little troubles that all the John Joneses all over the world ever since the world began fought with, but you will become the greatest thing in the world—for faith is only an entrance into the life of Christ. The important thing about a house is not the door but the dwelling itself. You in Christ and Christ in you. That is the burden of your faith. Today with the Jubilee closing and the memory of Christ's great sacrifice upon us, it should be so easy to receive the jolt that Thomas got. The cross was for me. Christ was hanged there for me. Christ offered himself for me and left himself as food for me. Notice how always we must say the same two words—Christ and me. You now must do the great thing which Christ wanted so strongly. You must melt the two into one—the Christ and the me, so that you can say with Paul, I live, no not I, but Christ liveth in me. When you say that, then your faith is sparkling. When you say that you will find that the world is a different place than you ever thought it could be. Then no matter what be the troubles that rest on your brow, you will find in your heart the peace of Christ, a peace which the world cannot give and which the world cannot take away.

Santiago Memorial Sermon For Franklin D. Roosevelt

There is something fearfully final in death. That is the reason why men are afraid to die and that is the reason why they mourn and lament their dead. It has, in consequence, been the soul-searching occupation of the great thinkers of our race to find an escape from this finality. These weavers of schemes have found many means to blunt the sharp edge of the knife that "slits the thin spun life," but it is not to our purpose to criticize their findings. We are too stunned by the age-old problem of death made manifest again in the passing of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, the President of our country.

It is not that we are so surprised that he should die, for we know full well that some day all men must drink of that cup. It is not that we are sorry for him, for "after life's fitful fever he sleeps well." It is not even that we fear for the consequences of this event in the future of our land for today more than ever we have a humble but strong faith in the destinies of our nation. What we feel is a sadness and a shock because of the disappearance of something that we loved, perhaps without being aware of it; and a malaise at the presence of a tragedy not only for ourselves but for the whole world.

This reaction to the death of President Roosevelt can only be explained by the meaning of his powerful personality, for it is only in terms of the meanings of things that life and existence become luminous. The last twelve years have been so deeply impressed by the spiritual profile of this man, that we cannot help but identify our immediate history with his thoughts and words. Even before he reached the highest office which our people could bestow on him, he was a national figure, stirring up moods and tendencies. There was something tremendously dynamic about him that produced a powerful activity in the wake of his progress. In the heat and burly of civic fray, there were many who looked upon him with dislike and with anger. There were many, many more who allowed themselves to be led by his force and vigor. There was none who looked on him with apathy and indifference. The Rooseveltian era was an era of energy, of activity, of movement. A brand had been flung into the waiting kindling of our nation, and it took instant flame. It is our earnest hope that this flame will warm and illuminate the world and posterity.

What was the reason for the great power of Franklin Delano Roosevelt? Was it merely the excellence of his talents? I think not. There have been men of greater genius in the history of our nation, men of greater learning, men of greater will power, men of greater general capacities. The real reason of his domination lay in his closer contact with our people. A file may be excellent, but if its contact with its object be imperfect, its efficiency is impaired. How can we explain this close contact between our lamented President and his people? It was not his upbringing. He was formed in an environment which is not common to the vast majority of

our land. He was never the hail fellow well met, nor yet the back-slapping politician. There were relatively few who knew him intimately. I lived next door to him for five years and I never saw him. And yet for me and millions of my countrymen Franklin Delano Roosevelt was something that we knew well and understood perfectly.

This strange paradox is explained by American life. Men who have never known us well are prone to interpret us badly. There is a nonchalance in our social intercourse which dismays the foreigner. There is a cynicism in our cracker-barrel philosophy which annoys the alien fanatic. There is a hardshelled practicality in our attitude toward life which irritates the dreamer and the knave. Yet all these things are accidentals in the phenomenon that the world calls America. The deeper thing which really makes us what we are cannot be adequately described because it is ascertainable only by a unique experience, the experience of being an Amrican. Our people are incurably utopian and optimistic. We have a deep and abiding faith in the proposition that men can by their common efforts, blessed by our common Father, God, build a better world in which to live. This better world, to be achieved by the cooperation of all, is not to be an enclosed reserve for a class, or for a group or for a party. It is for all, no matter what be their origin, their blood, their creed. This is Americanism. This is the inner nucleus of the man who boasts of the climate of California, of the man who preserves the ancestral ways of life in the Kentucky hills, of the man who feels superior because of the bustle and immensity of New York, of the man who is proud of the stern virtues of a stern New England. They are different, all of them; their ways of life are not the same; their language is distinct; their interests are diverse; but in all of them there glows the general inner vision which one of our historians has happily called "The American Dream." Dreams are vague things. It is hard to express them truly. They have no clear outlines. They are hazy and often indefinite. Yet they can be projected on the material screen of life. What is of greater importance they can be incarnated. They can take on human flesh. It is only too true that we can see dreams walking. This general truth is the explanation of the close contact that Franklin Delano Roosevelt had with his people. This explains why it hurts us deeply

to see him go. He was the American dream incarnate and just as we love our dream, and because we love it, we also loved our President, who in his life, in his words and in his actions put visible flesh and human form on the American dream. He was the American dream walking.

Loyal Americans all

I am convinced that today there is not a single man in the United States of America who is not sincerely sad because of the death of our late President. I read the eulogies of him expressed by his erstwhile political adversaries and I know that their words are sincere. Perhaps today for the first time in their lives bitter opponents of our former chief realize that they loved him always. It is impossible that it be not so, for these opponents, loyal Americans all, love the American dream and today we have all become painfully conscious of the long patent fact that Roosevelt was the most vivid manifestation of the American dream that our nation has produced in many years.

Such, as I see it, is the meaning of the sadness we all feel because of the death of Franklin Roosevelt. This inner meaning which escapes the superficial observation of those who do not think is also a great reason for our consolation and peace. Mr. Roosevelt was a great man; that is evident to all of us as it will be evident to all future historians. But his greatness was not the result of a capricious generosity of a blind fate. It was only a fuller realization of the vision which has been the heritage of us all. The real President Roosevelt, the Roosevelt, whom we admired, trusted and followed is not dead nor will he ever die as long as our nation stays true to its inner self. He will have new reincarnations in the future just as he himself was nothing but the reincarnation in our time of Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln. He can and must have minor reincarnations in the little hamlets that stud our western plains, in the urban wards of our metropolitan centers and even beyond the American frontier in the isolated colonies of Americans who live in China and in Chile, in Russia and in Rhodesia.

This is the practical meaning of our mourning service. We are not united here to fulfill a sterile ritual, much less to weep idle tears. We have met like ancient warriors about the burning pyre

of their perished chieftain, to give their last salute to one who went on before them and then gird up anew their loins for battle.

We salute him for what he was, in the words he used of another, a happy warrior. We salute him for his faith in man and in God. We salute him for his hope in better things to come. We salute him for his wide and universal love, for the poor and the afflicted, for the persecuted, and the down-trodden, for all his countrymen and for the men of all the world. May his spirit ever hover over us, his counsel guide us, his example move us. May his memory remain green always in our annals. God bless him and his people forever. Amen.

* * *

This distinguished, wise man and theologian deservedly won the friendship and respect of all men of good will of every creed. Fr. Weigel will be sorely missed.

ARTHUR J. GOLDBERG
Former Associate Justice,
Supreme Court

THOUGHTS ON LATIN AMERICA

In the summer of 1937, having just completed his doctoral dissertation at the Gregorian University in Rome, Gus Weigel was assigned to Chile. His first reaction was to seek out a map to find where Chile was. Somewhat reluctantly, he went to assume the Chair in Dogma at the Catholic University in Santiago, but it was a far more reluctant gringo who finally departed from Chile eleven years later. Left behind were a generation of seminarians and students whose attitudes towards Christianity and the social order were largely shaped by "El Gringo" and countless others who were touched by his contagious openness and obvious love for them.

He also became an institution within the American colony. For years he preached and celebrated the Sunday Eucharist for the American Catholics, besides being chosen to give addresses on several special occasions, such as the Memorial services for Franklin Roosevelt. When rumors first circulated that he would be recalled to the United States, Claude Bowers, then Ambassador to Chile, urged Fr. Weigel's Provincial to reconsider. "Father Weigel's work here," he wrote, "not only in the University and among the students, has been really distinguished, and he has been invaluable to the Embassy and, I think, to our country. For some years I have consulted him regularly on matters touching upon his mission and American interests. While a majority of North Americans here are not Catholics, I know no one in the American colony who is so popular or who has such prestige in the colony. . . . While I realize perfectly that I have no real right to attempt interference with the plans of his Order I am impelled by my affection and admiration for him and my appreciation of the splendid help he has rendered the Embassy in delicate matters, to beg you, if at all possible, to return him to Chile where he is so much needed."

Despite this plea, Gus was recalled to the United States. Upon his return, the Chilean government presented to him the Order of Merit in recognition of his outstanding contributions in social and educational work. What an impact he had had was still apparent eight years later in 1956 when he made a speaking tour of Chile and Columbia on a grant from the State Department.

The selections are from three phases of his Chilean experience. The first two date from the early years. The third, "The American Citizen's Obligation to South America," was one of a series of lectures on Latin America delivered by Father Weigel shortly after his reassignment to Woodstock. The last selection, "The Latin Dimension of the Americas" was given in 1956 on a similar lecture tour following his trip to Chile and Colombia.

Chile: 1938 and After

Yesterday morning I was talking to a distinguished Chilean here in New York City. He showed me a clipping from a recent number of the Santiago "Diario Ilustrado," one of the important Santiago newspapers. The paper gave an account of the speech of the president of the Chilean Communist Party, Sr. Contreras Labarca, to a large mass meeting of the Communists. As quoted, Sr. Contreras said that 1940 was the year that should see the liquidation of the class which we might call in English, the landed gentry. He further stated that all who would not support the government should be shot. He urged his hearers to keep a watch on the plutocratic oligarchy and punish them if they should rise against the present regime as he said they were planning.

This sort of thing is not novel since 1938 nor was it very novel before that. Since 1938 it has a new significance, a significance that bodes ill for the internal peace of Chile. Before we go any further, let me warn my listeners that their concept of Communist will not exactly portray the Chilean Communist. The Chilean Communist is much more Chilean than Communist, nor is he well informed about

the tenets of dialectical materialism. He will be sympathetic to Russia and Mexico, but he does not seriously interest himself in those two countries. He has only one preoccupation, and that preoccupation is the betterment of the lot of the Chilean laborer and his ideas about such betterment are vague, with only one clear element: that the wealthy Chilean must be made to disgorge and the laborer must receive more salary. . . .

The countryside of Chile is an anachronism today. It is governed by a feudal system that is interesting but which has disappeared in western Europe and in the United States, where something like it existed in the antebellum south. The land owner works his farm with help that belongs to the soil which is worked. Of course the toiler is not tied to the farm in the sense that he lacks the liberty to leave it. He is a free man politically and socially. He can go where he pleases and when he pleases. Economically, however, he is as much part of the estate as the horses and the cattle. He lives in a shabby little house that does not belong to him and he may use some few acres of land that belong to the master of the hacienda. His salary is meager, perhaps some fifteen cents a day for the days he works for the master, and he works for the master most of the time. Since the cities suck in the surplus humanity of the farms, which always produce a surplus, the cities live on a low wage scale; for a wage slightly above farm wages will be enough to allure the young farmer to the metropolitan communities. The net result is that proletarian Chile is poorly paid, and primarily because the agriculture does not permit economic independence for the majority of its people.

This condition is old in Chile but it is aggravated by a change in the manner of living produced by the industrialism of the present century. Before the advent of mass production, the articles of comfort were neither plentiful nor desired. Life was more simple and this simplicity was prevalent in all classes of society. A superior education is a great asset but it is not an asset that produces much envy in those who do not have it, if its lack is not an obstacle to physical well being in terms of known comforts. The fact that some one has been in Paris makes me wish I had been there too but if we both live together more or less the same way, it does not make me envious, especially if my imagination is dull. Then, too, there

was the absence of universal education which necessarily kept the uneducated masses content with their fate since to use the popular expression, they didn't know any better.

Industrialism and the coming of universal education changed all that. Railroads and autos cut into isolation. Movies and latterly the radio opened up new horizons. Education made the printed word powerful even when it did little more. People became aware that there were different ways of living and they became conscious that the man who reaped the lion's share of the harvest and who could mortgage the land and then pay back his mortgage by tricks like devaluating the money was in a privileged condition. Then envy sprang up and sprang up more vigorously in the cities where it was a mass envy. This envy was then deliberately fomented by men who used it to enhance their own political positions or by men who felt that they should be admitted into the privileged position but were not received by the class who enjoyed the privilege. A thing I wish to insist upon is that this envy was not fomented by far-seeing, kindly men who lamented the situation and who were anxious to do something about it. Such men can be found in all classes. They are the idealists and the sincere reformers. Such men are rarely idols of the people they are trying to help, for they have nothing of the demagogue about them. You all remember Ibsen's "Enemy of the People." . . .

Here is the crux of the whole Chilean question. The year 1938 and thereafter are important because we see what is being done by men who are attempting new solutions. What we see does not seem encouraging. Contreras Labarca's speech proves an absolutely false conception of the problem. That conception is simplistic because it presumes that Chile's difficulty is caused by the malicious selfishness of an oligarchy. Obviously the difficulty in Chile is the unequal distribution of land, but that is an inherited difficulty and not one produced by any one living today. The elimination of this class will not necessarily produce the universal happiness desired. If among a hundred men 98 have one dollar apiece and two have $100 apiece, an equal distribution among all will give each man $2.98. The result is that no one is much richer for the distribution. The spoliation of two did not substantially help the ninety-eight. Worst of all, if the 98 are wastrels who throw their money away, the

entire group will be impoverished by the distribution. All lose and no one gains. It might, in such a case, be wise to keep for the two men their 100 dollars because the group will be richer because of them, even if they be malicious.

Popular front

Contreras Labarca is not in the moment an important figure in Chile but Contreras Labarca represents one element in the attempt to redress a wrong. Another element is the Socialist party which does not see eye to eye with the solution of Labarca. The third element is the Radical party which differs from both of its Popular Front allies. In other words the Popular Front has no one solution for the problem even though they can agree on certain measures. They agree on certain measures but they see entirely different values in the measures approved.

Practically it has not lived up its promises. It has not remedied any serious ill of the land, nor has it even taken one step which will lead to such a remedy. It has only consolidated its position and taken steps to crush the opposition. The result is that the government fears for its life because it is well aware that its victory was sheerly political. Political victories can only be maintained by crushing the political adversary. The government was a registration of discontent but if the government can do nothing to dissipate the discontent, then it is ready to disappear because it will not have the backing of the people which it needs to keep itself in power. When solutions fail, then demagoguery must come to the fore. There is much of that in Chile today. This constant defamation of the landed gentry contributes nothing to national well being. It merely keeps the people hostile to the aristocrats in order to keep them out of power. That is demagoguery. The confession of bankruptcy of the Popular Front was the howl for the demission of Sr. Wachholz, not by the Rightists but by the Leftists. The reason for this howl was that Sr. Wachholz was adopting a policy which was similar to that of former Rightist governments. Wachholz is not a Rightist but he was anxious to help Chile. The Leftist demagogues were not anxious to see Chile helped if that meant using Rightist tactics. It meant that their solutions were no solutions at all. Yet Wachholz was retired from the cabinet.

As I see it, the Popular Front has given Chile nothing and I can

see no salvation in it. Not on that account do I wish to say that the solution is a restoration of the Rightists. It is good that they learned that their policies produced no content in the people. The only salvation for the country is a reform of the people at large. Whether such a restoration is possible I do not know. If it is possible, it will be achieved only by a proper education of the entire citizenry, and by education I do not mean merely a divulgation of the capacity to read. The people must be taught to be thrifty, self-controlled, industrious and conscious of personal dignity. At present they are extravagant, indulgent, lazy and undignified, though very proud. The government needed in Chile is the government that will push this program on the nation. When the people have learned these virtues the semislavery of the large farms and the horrible poverty of the city will end. However, these virtues will never be taught if education is materialistic in its vision, be the government Rightist or Leftist. The true curse of Chile is that since the end of the last century all education is directed by such a vision.

* * *

We were one in the awareness of the necessity to give ourselves completely as witnesses for the holy Name. A powerful and courageous witness has left us. The only comfort may be found in the hope that the seeds Fr. Weigel has sown will continue to grow, so that God may find our hearts worthy to dwell in them.

RABBI ABRAHAM HESCHEL
Jewish Theological Seminary

Letter to Ambassador to Argentina

November 24, 1941,
Santiago de Chile.

H. E., Mr. Norman Armour,
American Ambassador,
Buenos Aires,
Argentine Republic.

My dear Mr. Armour:

As I threatened, I am writing. In the first place to thank you formally for your kindness to me and my group. I appreciated it very much and the boys were impressed. . . .

I speak only on the basis of my observations in Chile. As you know only too well, it is dangerous to generalise for all South America from data available in one country.

The position of the Catholic Church in Chile is a strange one. The country is supposed to be Catholic but the Church has not the influence nor strength that she has in the United States. The reason for this is manifold. First of all, we must make a distinction between religiosity and a religion. The former is something quite spontaneous, at least in a definite ethnological setting. This spontaneous religiosity is nothing but a firm yet vague belief in the existence of a Supreme Being who exercises certain influence in the events of men. Such a belief carries with it the acceptance of some kind of a moral code and the will to manifest the basic belief in certain rites performed at stated times: birth, adolescence, marriage and death. Now this vague belief along with its morality and rites can take on the color of a definite religion without taking all that religion represents. In such a case we find the natural religiosity expressing itself in forms that are proper to a more definite religious vision. This is the situation in Chile. There is prevalent in the whole nation a spontaneous religiosity of a low intellectual content and of a very liberal moral code. This religiosity is genuine,

in the sense that the people by and large accept it willingly and without any other pressure than that offered by traditional environment. It is a mistake to identify this religiosity with Catholicism, even though the religiosity is manifested exclusively in Catholic forms. Catholicism has no influence on the majority of the people. Catholic forms are accepted because the natural religiosity never evolved other forms. Is Chile a Catholic nation? Yes, if by that we mean that it accepts Catholic forms to express whatever religiosity is present. No, if by that we mean that it accepts a Catholic vision of life.

Secondly, we must make another distinction. Catholicism is a social organism and it is also an inner vision. The same rites are expressions of both the institution and the vision. Now it is possible to belong to the institution without sharing deeply, or hardly at all, the vision. It is also possible that the social institution with its social framework be taken over in the concrete by men who do not understand the vision. In such a case there exists a conflict between the institution and the vision. This conflict will produce tension for the Catholic group because there will be many who appreciate the lack of conformity between the political organization and the inner spirit of the thing. Worst of all, the Church will be judged by the institution which is more visible than the vision, and the organization is always the carrier of the vision, even where the concrete local institution does not reflect the vision accurately. Even where the institution is not fundamentally at variance with the inner vision, it may reflect the vision badly because the institution is not constructed according to the exigencies of the times. It may reflect the vision in terms that are proper to the age whose organization the institution still preserves, terms no longer intelligible to the people of the actual age.

Thirdly, it is easy to identify the institution with the more prominent constitutents of the institution, even though such an identification is illegitimate because the institution is made up of *all* the members who make it up. Because of the peculiar structure of Catholicism as an institution, the bishops *de jure* and the priests *de facto* are the most prominent members. We might add to these two categories the laymen honored by the clergy in a special way: deference, positions of trust, papal honors. It is because of the

facility of identifying the institution with this group that many non-Catholics see in Catholicism an outstanding example of clericalism. As I have pointed out, such an identification is not legitimate, and there is nothing that I, a clergyman, resent more than such a shallow identification of Catholicism with clericalism. However, it must be admitted that the influence of the clergy in Catholicism is much more profound than in Protestant forms of Christianity. The reason for this is historic. Most of the work which is taken up by the laity in Protestant groups is done by the clergy in the Catholic Church: missions, propaganda, teaching, defense, charities and administration. The result is that Catholics interested in these activities enter the religious life, which for convenience's sake we here classify as clergy, including thus secular priests, religious priests, lay brothers and sisters.

Church power

Fourthly, where the Church is identified with clericalism, it is possible to find an antagonism to the Church, even though its rites are used to express the natural religiosity of the people. . . .

Just what power the Catholic Church has here is a very obscure question. It is not dominant, that much is certain. Yet it is not without force, that is also certain. Through its vision it controls many of the best elements among the youth. This is an important point that must not be forgotten. The intellectual hold of Catholicism is much stronger in the younger circles than in the older groups who are in fact in power. Through its institutional organization it controls or influences about the fifth or sixth part of the population in Chile. (I am saying that roughly some million Chileans belong to the Catholic Church in a true sense.) Through its rites it reaches practically all of the population at one time or another. Open anticlericalism is not the vogue, not even among the Communists. Latent anticlericalism is active as a conscious attitude among the bourgeois intelligentsia and as an unconscious attitude in vast sectors of the working class. The reason why this anticlericalism is latent is because the Church has been definitely eliminated from all positive participation in political action. Whatever participation the Church has in this field is purely negative. Since this was speciously what the first anticlericals proposed as the end of

their campaign against the Church, they cannot arouse more opposition of the people to the Church, and their campaign is halted. Obviously this situation leaves the Church in a position to influence anew the people. . . . The Left is consciously trying to win the cooperation of the Church, and this time the Church is showing itself wise in offering cooperation in all details that do not go counter to her basic theory. This is important, because the fundamental visions of the Left and the Catholic Church are essentially opposed; materialism versus spiritualism. There is the antagonism, not in concrete measures which could spring from either philosophy. This mutual disposition of the two to work without friction proves that neither side considers itself sufficiently strong to venture a decisive battle. The Left has gained so much that it does not wish to risk its hard gained advances and the Catholic Church does not wish to go under a cloud again as it did in the last century, and from which it is only now slowly and with difficulty emerging.

What is the Church's attitude to Panamericanism? Obviously there is no official attitude. First of all, the Chilean Catholics are Chileans and their basic reaction to the United States is identical to that of all Chileans: admiration and fear. Because they are Catholics certain added factors come into play. America has meant Protestantism to the average South American. It also has meant Liberalism. . . .

Another thing that antagonized the Catholics against America was the attitude of many Americans who came here to live or to study the country. These frequently sympathized overtly with all that the anti-Catholic forces were doing and spoke bitterly against the Catholic activities. Some of this can be seen in the books formerly written about South America by Americans. The Americans usually did as they did with no bad faith. They were brought up in an environment totally distinct from that of South America. Many of the things that the liberals proposed were good things, things that we had in the United States and which we all enjoyed. Consequently the American favored them and was irked by the Catholic opposition to them. There came to him all the legends of priestcraft, clerical tyranny and oppression which formed a part of his childhood information about Catholicism. It all seemed to hang together. However, he did not see that the liberal was basically not

interested in the concrete reform he was advocating. He was interested only in one thing: the overthrow of the old spiritual concept of life and society in order to implant a materialistic pattern of reality. Granted that the Church should have made distinctions and shown to what precisely she objected. However, this failure of the Church did not justify the Americans to rest serene in their ignorance of the actual meaning of the combat and align themselves completely with the materialistic faction. Such things leave bitter memories. It is never wise to overlook the positive values in the adversary's position. If these are recognized and admitted, it is usually not difficult to come to terms with the adversary. But if we shout for his head, it is obvious that he will fight every advance that we make to get at his head. . . .

What do I suggest? First, that the American government recognise the existence of Catholicism as one of the forces in South America. One of the forces, and not necessarily the main force. I do not think that it would be wise to "play up" to the South American Catholics, suddenly presenting ourselves as champions of all things Catholic. This would antagonize the Left, which is also a force. . . . We must try to convince our journalists and lecturers that they must study very carefully disputed issues of a religious nature—religious explicitly or by implication—before they pontificate about them. Let them hear both sides of the debate and not take sides until they are honestly and prudently convinced of their position. You see, I am not urging the censorship of what they write, but I urge that they be convinced of the responsibility they have when they do write. However, I know that the embassies do work in this direction.

However, the important thing we must do is convince the American Catholics that the most effective missionary work they can do for the good of their church and their country is here in South America. We must bring down many American priests to open schools and colleges. We must bring down American nuns to work in educational institutions and social centers. The American Catholics must make sacrifices to bring young South Americans to their colleges and universities. We must urge collaboration in Catholic projects and Catholic intellectual endeavor between the American Catholic groups and the South American equivalents. How Wash-

ington can aid in this I do not know. I find in American Catholics a shocking apathy toward this, their obvious duty. This apathy is in part due to ignorance of South America and in part to an isolated concentration on their own affairs. The American Catholics are in the best position to furnish a strong link between the United States and South America. Their work would be more effective because it would be done without the hovering shadow of Washington to obscure the merits. It is nothing short of lamentable to see how they are wasting a golden opportunity to realize a true Panamericanism. . . .

Sincerely yours,
Gustave Weigel, S.J.

* * *

I ran into Fr. Weigel only once, which was enough to experience a kindness for him: and I have thought of him as a great rock, a great force, for sanity, and goodness, and the intellect.

WILLIAM F. BUCKLEY
Editor, National Review

The American Citizen's Obligation to South America

We receive many benefits from the Southern continent and hope to receive more. By that fact we have obligations to it. If we owe South Americans part of our well-being, then we are obliged to them. They have a right to expect a return from us. I cannot insist too much that it is a question of right. If we do anything in favor of the Southern lands, this must not be entered under the heading of noble benevolence and high-souled charity. It comes under the heading of debit. . . .

It would not be an exaggeration to say that at least half of the dwellers of the southern continent live on a sub-human level of existence. Anyone who has seen how the Indians live, will know that this is true for almost all of them and they are many millions. Likewise the Creole proletariat, in the city and more especially on the land, lives in a manner that makes it more similar to the Indian way of life than ours, and the proletariat in any community is always numerically the greater part. The poverty of all these people astounds the American who sees it for the first time, though its equal can be found here especially in the Negro tenements of our big cities or in the Negro cabins of the South. A French sociologist told me that he saw conditions in South America which were, if anything, worse than what he had seen in China. Even the wealthy people of the South are so only relatively. In Chile one can be a millionaire in pesos which would be only 15,000 dollars in our country, and there are not many thousands of such millionaires in Chile. An income of a million pesos annually would never give the millionaire a life of sybaritic luxury as we conceive that term. It certainly will not enable him to endow a million dollar college or build a hundred thousand dollar laboratory.

South American distances are enormous and there are still vast open spaces. Isolated small communities are the order of the day and communications with the larger centers and other communities are not very good. The aeroplane has helped to connect the different municipalities but railroads are slow and not always very

efficient. This gives a primitive mode of life to smaller communities and to the country side. The accelerated rhythm so characteristic of the eastern seaboard of the United States is lacking in South America except for some metropolitan zones that can be counted on one hand. There is still a leisureliness about South American business and activity that irritates or even exasperates the American, but the Latin is quite satisfied with it, and attempts at change have met with ignominious defeat. Everywhere there is still a full break of the working day between one and three in the afternoon. During this period offices, stores, churches and even schools do not function. It is a mistake to call this the siesta hour, because the custom of taking the siesta is fast dying out. It is a break in the day, given over to lunch, relaxation and conversation. The effect of this institution and others that rise from a slower tempo of life in general makes it impossible to get things done at once. You must wait. It is useless to be impatient.

Government is palpable in South America to a degree unknown here. The State must be stimulus, control, watchman, organizer, mother and guardian of all of life. The reason for this is found in the extreme individualism so typical of Spanish culture and also in the poverty of the individuals of the community. The result, however, is that the national government is everywhere and in everything. Schools, colleges and universities pertain to its jurisdiction and domain; hygiene and public welfare institutions like hospitals and asylums are under its direction or supervision; the railroads are government property; small and large loans come through government agencies; banks and business are under its control; much of the insurance is handled by governmental institutions. In consequence there is a colossal bureaucracy which works in a wooden fashion and with no speed. This incubus broods over all South American life and its effect on initiative and expedite action is deadening. It gives rise to the temptation of cutting corners and engenders the ambition of the more audacious to control this clumsy machine by controlling the government. Everyone is politically minded because politics play such an important part in Latin America.

The Latin is strong on the emotional and instinctive side of life. He is a rapid thinker but he does not pursue thought for itself. He

understands logic perfectly but he has no patience for metaphysics. Duty and practical organization do not appeal to him. The result is that he is capricious and inconstant. He is consequently accustomed to inefficiency and he does not mind if things do not work. A resignation that is closely akin to apathy and fatalism colors his outlook on life. He tries to get the most pleasure out of the moment and is willing to bear the ills he has rather than fly to others he knows not of.

These basic facts must be taken into consideration when dealing with South America. If they are not borne in mind, our relations with Latin lands will be unsatisfactory to us and them. . . .

What does South America need? So many things. It would like to improve its roads and communications. It wants and needs better schools, better formed teachers, more scientifically trained technicians and better equipped laboratories of all kinds. . . .

Money

Now almost all of these needs, so many and so pressing, can readily be summed up by the word, money. The Ibero-American does sum it up in this way and to a superficial student of the South American scene the same summation appears logical—but the whole point is that this simplification is fallacious. If we could, and we cannot, give to South America all the money that it needs for its various worthy projects, our problem in relations would not disappear. A mere loan or contribution would hardly solve the difficulty. There are even arguments against sending down much money. The danger is very great that much of it would be diverted to projects that are not necessary nor useful, and some of the money would be squandered or stolen outright. . . .

One easy solution would be for us to administer the money and supervise its spending. This is no solution because it would be an insult to people whom we are repaying for favors. They would hardly be pleased and they would not tolerate the gesture. The only solution that is the right one is to become real friends before we give anything officially on a grand scale. Two friends know each other and trust each other. They recognize each other's virtues and their weakenesses. When one of the two friends is in need, the other one will help efficiently without wounding the dignity and inviolability of his friend's personality. Friends do not dictate nor do

they humiliate each other. In the hour of need, we expect our friends to come around and roll up their sleeves and set to work, but we don't want the occasional visitor or officious rich man to take off his coat and rearrange our furniture according to his idea of fair and foul. Any help that we give at present would be like that of the casual visitor who takes it upon himself to rearrange the South American's house. The South American just like his North American neighbor will only grow angry at such high-handed tactics. Even if we were very circumspect in the manner of administering our aid, we would still be hated. We hate people who help us when the help is humiliating, and only aid from a loved friend is free of such unpleasant characteristics.

Friendship cannot be produced merely by wishing it. Friendship is a form of love and no one loves what he does not know. At the actual moment the Latin American does not truly know us and we do not know the Latin. Books alone will not give the knowledge that is needed. Books can only give a superficial acquaintance with concrete things. The concrete must be experienced by ourselves or others who vitally communicate their experience, otherwise it is never properly known. Hence, the North American and South American must live with an experience of each other.

At first sight, this means to be a large order, but on analysis it will not be so formidable as it sounds. Obviously we are not going to send half of our people to South America nor will half of Latin America come to us. However, some of the people of the Southern Hemisphere can come here to live with us. The persons most indicated are those who will have a large part in the life in their communities on their return home. I do not mean by this the politicians but rather those elements in the community who are in intimate contact with members of larger groups. Such men and women are professional workers, especially in the fields of teaching, spiritual guidance, welfare work, doctors, labor leaders etc. These men and women mould public opinion. These should be brought here in their years of formation or shortly after; they should be made members of our communal household and treated for what they are, relatives from far away, not as strangers who must be received with empty ceremony, or ignored and neglected. They must live with us for long periods in which they can see our hopes

and fears, our aspirations and our failures, our petty virtues and our petty vices. They will see us with our hair down and we shall have spoken to them with the accents of spontaneity and naturalness. We are not ogres, and I believe that we can be loved. When our cousins have seen this, they will love us and when they return to their own communities they will communicate their affection to others without plan and without compulsion, and that is the most efficient way of communicating love.

In like manner we must go down to their lands; not all, but those who can exercise their activities there with profit to themselves and to their hosts. Teachers are needed south of the Rio Grande, and they will be welcomed, but they will have to expect only a slight remuneration which is the lot of all teachers in those communities. Priests and nuns are needed in vast numbers; at least 40,000 priests and probably more sisters. These men and women would not be intruding, because they are of the same faith as those whom they would serve and they would be welcomed by most of the local religious leaders. Doctors might not be so welcome because the Latin republics have defended their own professional men by making it very difficult for outsiders to work in these fields, but nurses are in demand as well as social workers trained in their specialty. Students could go down, but they must remember that studies in Ibero-America are structured along different lines than here. It is not possible to dovetail studies made here with those taught there. Nor would it be beneficial to a North American student to make his full course of studies in South America unless he wishes to remain there for the rest of his life. The student who goes down for two or three years must be a free lance scholar, especially in the fields of Spanish, Portugese, South American literature, culture and history. Just how much good is done to the North American by six week courses in South American cities I do not know. I suppose more good is done than evil, but not much.

The tourist

What about the tourist? The folders in the Travel Bureaus paint a lovely scene and pleasant voyages seem to be the easiest way of getting many of our people to the Southern world. Unfortunately, this is so. However, too often it is not a help to international relations. When in Rome, where I saw so many American visitors, I

sadly came to the conclusion that the State Department in Washington should give an examination to all future tourists with the hope of keeping home the common or garden variety of trippers. It is so humiliating to see our countrymen making such dismal impressions in foreign lands. The North American should know that there is no need to become incensed because the hot water is not hot in a community where no one cares if it is hot or cold. Nor must he raise the roof off the dining room because they have no corn-flakes for his breakfast. A man who acts so, is not visiting foreign lands; he thinks he is visiting North America and he feels unjustly treated because it turns out not to be the United States. Since his interests are so North American, let him stay here. Nor does he help much by taking pictures of local customs as if they were relics of primitive barbarism which he will show to his friends back home to prove how backward non-Americans are.

What about the technically trained specialist and the investor? That is, indeed, a sore point. They should both go down because they are needed but they must go down with a certain attitude. The South American quite humanly resents the sight of his national wealth being taken off to foreign ports. He also hates to work under foreign bosses. However, he does need foreign capital and he does need foreign technicians until he has his own. If the American investor realizes that his task is a temporary one and that he will invest for a short time rather than have a permanent source of rich profit, and if the technician knows that he is there to teach know-how rather than to boss, then he will be welcome and he will do much good to North and South America alike. Moreover, he personally will be losing absolutely nothing.

However, the question of inter-American migration does not demand the travel of many North Americans to the South. It demands that our people help certain types of North Americans to live in South America. Teachers and social workers should be given monetary aid so that they will be able to live and work in Latin republics with a minimum of decency and comfort. The salaries that they will receive down below will not achieve that, and yet these men and women are the ones that Ibero-America needs and the ones who will help us most to produce a solid friendship between the three parts of the New World.

For the same reason our colleges and universities should give every facility whereby many thousands of students from the Latin lands can be enabled to come here. The expenses of coming north and paying board and keep are far beyond the means of the overwhelming majority of South Americans and yet so many wish to come and should. Perhaps the schools should be aided in this work by outside foundations and funds, but one way or another, this must be done. I consider it the first and most urgent obligation.

But travel will affect only a small part of our populations. The stay-at-homes, however, are not without obligations on that account. We must realize that South America exists and we must know how important it is to us. We should, in consequence, take a tremendous interest in it and have valid ideas concerning it. Schools on all levels must give courses on Latin American history and culture. Adult education organizations and media should make South America one of their major themes. Loose talk in magazines, films and papers about the Latin peoples must be severely censored by enlightened public opinion. The harm done to Inter-American friendship by ignorant and irresponsible remarks about our southern friends is incalculable. They are remembered a long time. A warm interest and a superficial knowledge of Latin American history and culture would eliminate this type of irritation.

Above all, our people so isolated from other lands, and basically so homogeneous in their way of life, must learn to appreciate and admit that there are many ways of living human life. Ways differing from our own are not silly because they are not our way. We should be curious to see the differences and find out why they exist. Such genuinely humanistic study might help us to modify and correct our own defective customs and institutions. It is high time that we get over the childish persuasion that we have the only rational way of doing things. Different historic and anthropological conditions with different geographical and climatic backgrounds obviously demand different solutions for the problem of living together. An Eskimo cloak makes perfect sense in the Arctic regions, though it makes little sense in Washington and it is nonsense in Guayaquil on the Equator. Let us keep this fundamental and obvious truth in mind. Only children laugh at the novel. Grown up men examine it. Only narrow-minded fanatics try, consciously or unconsciously, to impose their way of life on all.

Only after the realization of a program as sketched can anything like a Marshall Plan for South America be effective and it is quite possible that such a program, if it had been executed long ago, would have eliminated the necessity of the discussion of a Marshall Plan for South America. How long it would take to bring about what I have foreshadowed, I could not say, but this I know that at least a generation would have to pass before its fruits would be seen. However, it seems to me, that the question of the day of the return of our affection is not a helpful one. We owe South America our friendship and assistance for all that she has done for us, perhaps unwillingly. Let us pay our debt, no matter what we may gain or lose by it.

* * *

The ways of providence are mysterious. There is no one on the ecumenical scene we could less afford to lose just now than Fr. Weigel. Perhaps this is a cue for the rest of us to take up the ecumenical encounter with greater vigor.

ROBERT McAFEE BROWN
Stanford University

The Latin Dimension of the Americas

. . . We wish to reflect on the Latin reality of America. At the present moment the Ibero-Americans are numerically about the same number as the population of the United States, some 167,000,000. Ever since 1928 it has been the energetic policy of our government to foster and strengthen the friendship between ourselves and the republics to the south. The Monroe Doctrine, almost 135 years old (1823), assumes that the peace and stability of the United States is threatened if any Latin-American republic is menaced. It is the well-founded belief in our country that close union with Latin-America is necessary for our welfare as well as for the welfare of the Ibero-American commonwealths.

Actually we have the same attitude toward Canada. But there is a difference. There is no anxiety involved in our consideration of our relations with our Canadian neighbors. We are good friends and neither they nor we are worried about it. Whatever difficulties arise, we look on them as problems in friendship but not threats against it. When problems of smaller dimensions arise from the south of the Rio Grande we become nervous. The reason is simple. The American-Latin friendship is not as hard nor as stable as that which exists between Canada and ourselves. In plain words, we do not get along as well with the Latin-Americans as we do with the Canadians.

The basic reason for this fact is that there exists a greater difference between us and the Latins. . . .

In the beginning in Latin America there were mainly two classes. The land-owning aristocrats numbered at most some ten percent. The rest were working folk. Iberian-born citizens did not wish to belong to the native proletariat, so that the Indians, Negroes and the mestizos born of them made up the ranks of hewers of wood and drawers of water. It was uncritically assumed that these beings were incapable of any other contribution to society than the employment of their muscles. They were not ill-treated on principle, even though in practice ill-treatment was not infrequent. They were considered as perpetual children under the care, guidance and

protection of the aristocratic *patrón*. They were given simple food, rude shelter and basic medical care. They could not ever, either themselves or their children, rise out of their class. They were serfs or servants and had to be content to remain so. Even the illegitimate sons and daughters of the aristocrats belonged to this class, because mixture automatically destroyed the title of aristocracy. Until the late years of the 19th century there was no education for these people. Even today in Colombia, a highly civilized land, more than 50 percent of the population is illiterate. The serfs, called peons or *inquilinos*, numbered something less than nine tenths of the Ibero-American communities.

There were citizens who were neither proletariat nor aristocrat. These were the bureaucratic officials of government, the lower clergy, doctors, schoolmasters, the master-craftsmen, ship-captains, small merchants and notaries. Altogether they did not make up more than five percent of the population.

This small middle class had to grow to make democracy possible. They did grow but it was a slow process. As they grew, they were aggressively unwilling to allow to the aristocrats the monopoly of government and privilege. The struggle of the 19th century up to our moment was the struggle between the growing middle class and the entrenched aristocracy. The middle class in 1900 represented less than a fifth of the whole but today is nearer a third. The proletariat comprises slightly less than two thirds. The aristocrats make up about five percent of the total, and their power and privilege are steadily decreasing. The upper levels of the proletariat and the lower aristocracy are swelling the middle class so much that aristocracy as an influential class will disappear by the end of the century. The reason for this change in the social structure is not a humanitarian drive in the society. The dynamism is strictly economic. Modern production needs a vast army of people witth some degree of education. Education raises inevitably the living standards of those who have enjoyed it. . . .

The American believes in voluntary team-work, in the possibility of overcoming difficulties by freely organized cooperative work. The American is ashamed of emotionalism. He stands for control to be achieved by inner discipline rather than outer law. No matter how many be his sins, he yet subscribes to a puritanical code of morals. He is afraid of government and puts restrictions on it but

he is obedient to government's demands. Practical reason, "horse sense" as we call it, rules our activity.

The Latin-American sees this pattern of life and action. He does in the abstract admit that it is a good thing, but concretely he does not want it for himself. For the American, life should be an orderly arrangement; for the Latin it should be a high adventure. The American wants stability; the Latin wants ecstasy. The Americans with their puritancial thought-patterns are always surprised at the Latin-American's free and easy virtue. The atmosphere of a Latin-American urban community is palpably charged with sex. Prostitution, with or without toleration of law, is an important element in Latin culture. Many a Latin may deprecate its existence but he will never deny its necessity. Sins of the flesh are peccadillos; according to some regrettable, according to others delightful, according to all unavoidable. The average Latin-American takes them for granted and in such a cultural climate the tempestuous adolescent matures.

Here an observation must be made. The wide open spirit toward matters sexual does no mean that Latin-America is a hot bed of lechery. It could be easily defended that comparing numerically act with act there is no more sex immorality in Latin-America than in the United States. I personally would be inclined to believe this. It is not the numeric incidence which singles out Latin-America; it is rather the openness with which it is done.

In the same way there is much heavy drinking in Latin-America. This will seem surprising to many who know Spain, Portugal and Italy, where drunkenness is no national problem. Yet in Latin-America alcoholic consumption is not productive of skid rows. Nor does the drinker generally manifest a psychic pathology. The Latin who periodically gets drunk does not morbidly crave strong drink. He can and does go long periods without it. When he drinks, it is for the euphoria he gets from alcohol. He is in search of ecstasy, not torpor. Eating, drinking and sex can produce an easy and quick ecstasy and that is why these things are valued. There is really nothing piggish in it as the Latin-American uses them. This search for ecstasy is deep in the Latin-American soul. It must be understood in order to understand the Latin-American. He always seeks colossal experiences and dreams up colossal programs. He despises the small and the prosaic. Don Quixote lives in him; this is the Latin's pride.

Life is for ecstasy. In consequence the humdrum monotony involved in the work needed for quotidian material existence is most unattractive south of the Rio Grande. Life is not for that. Our powers should be directed to the ecstatic and gigantic. The dull little tasks demanded by a routinary life are unworthy of the true man and they should be turned over to a lesser breed. Here we have the great problem of Latin-American. Since in their value-scheme life is to be ecstatically enjoyed and enriched by fantastic projects, the role of modest, plodding, methodic work is contemned. The true man should not work at the task of merely acquiring food, drink, raiment and shelter. An inferior can do that, and obviously only an inferior will do it. Perhaps by force of circumstances it may be necessary for a man to engage in economic labor, but this is in order to get free from it as quickly as possible. Hence the Latin-American has a strong tendency to get rich quickly. In every Latin-American country the lottery is a flourishing enterprise. There is a tendency to overcharge for services. There is shoddiness in the product delivered. All these things are consequent on the general low esteem for economic labor.

Yet this does not mean that the Latin-American shirks the expense of energy. He is always capable of incredible feats of endurance and productivity. But these capacities need a high purpose for their exercise. The Latin-American is not lazy. There isn't a lazy bone in him, but he does not see why he should use his noble powers for ignoble things. He would rather eat poorly and live in a hovel than dedicate his vibrant energies to the task of being just a little better off. This is why he considers America to be materialistic, for the Americans spend their time and efforts for food, shelter and domestic comfort. No Latin-American feels that he has great need of these. It was for me illuminating to see the ease with which aristocrats would adjust to the rudest circumstances though normally accustomed to luxurious living. The Latin-American wants the very best there is, but he is not willing to undergo the drudgery of producing it. Others should do that. Hence the place of the servant is prominent in Latin-America, and yet the servants are not efficient. The reason is that neither master nor servant believes in the dignity and universal vocation of work. All look on work as a most unjust and undignified but temporary necessity from which you must escape as fast as possible—and at any price.

Energies should be expended on heroic objectives. In sport and martial exploits the Latin-American is magnificent. He puts his all into the game. He can climb mountains, ride horse, play soccer, explore the jungle, engage in tennis with a devotion and dedication which are intense. For a political, cultural or religious cause he will wear himself to the bone. But he does not do these things out of a sense of duty but rather because of his love of the gigantic and ecstatic. When such things become mere routine for monetary recompense, the Latin-American loses interest and becomes bored. Every program which requires the self-sacrificing plodding of a long routine fails in Ibero-America. Even in religious conversion, the Latin-American wants to become a saint in a hurry.

There is another paradox in the southern hemisphere. The Ibero-American has a strong sense of fellowship coupled to a stronger sense of individuality. There is an excessive sensitivity about personal ability. One must be careful never to insinuate even through inadvertence that the Latin is physically, and above all mentally, less than perfect. Nor can you cast any reflection derogatory to any member of his family, which includes all his sisters and his cousins and his aunts.

The individualist

The Latin is so much an individualist that he judges all things by his own individual norms. What he wants is right, and he must have it. If the law is against it, the law must be bypassed. The law is for others; never for himself. While learning, he must do it his way. He sees no need to do it according to another's prescription. The fact that his own way may not be efficient, disturbs him not at all. If the knowledge of the accepted way is important to gain the respect of his associates, he will learn it perfectly—but he does not feel bound to follow it. Personal integrity and individual originality are important. Efficiency and teamwork are secondary values.

In consequence the Latin resents government and yet needs it badly. Only the government with its power to coerce can get things done. Only the government can execute projects and maintain them, because it applies coercion on the recalcitrant individuals. Without coercion taxes will not be paid, common cooperation will not be achieved, the economy will not flourish, social amelioration will not

become effective. Hence one can see how important government is to the Latin-American and why its bureaucracy is all-pervasive. He is perforce interested in politics. He wants a government made up of men with his views and if there is no way of getting them in by ballots, then a revolution is employed. Actually most Latin-American revolutions are not revolutions; they are only changes of government by the simple device of ousting the actual governors physically. Individualism makes every Latin political and the Latin político is still an individualist. Hence political chicanery is used by the ins and outs because all is fair in love and war. The word "my country" means much to a Latin, but it is important because it is mine. Even in prayer the Latin prays to *my* God and to *my* saint.

We have already touched on the Latin's pride of his own intellectual capacity. Actually this capacity is very high. The rapidity with which the Latin learns is amazing. The brilliance of his conversation leaves the slow American overwhelmed. The spriteliness of his wit and humor dazzle. Why, then, has not this intelligence solved the social and economic problems of Latin-America? For reasons we have already seen, the Latin has no patience with slow methodic acquisition of data for his intellectual schemes. He wants immediate scintillating intuitions. The only test he recognizes for his thought is logic—inner consistency. He has a keen sense of logic and he does not have to learn it by rule. Every Latin is born a lawyer.

In consequence, the Latin's thought-schemes for life and work disdain the labor of detailing them toward application to existence. He often ignores the reality to which they are to be applied. Much of the reform-thinking to be found in Ibero-America is superficial and utopian because it refuses to investigate or recognize the stubborn realities of the actual situation. Hence Latin-American philosophy is either an ostentatious demonstration that the Latin-American knows what the classical and modern philosophers teach or it is a passionate effusion of personal intuition. It is not disciplined philosophy like Aristotle, Aquinas, Kant and Hegel made it. It is Nietzschean rhapsody. In like manner Latin-American science is content with the synthetic representation of the conquests of others. It shows no initiative to undertake original research and

many a Latin-American believes that such research can be better left to slower minds.

Where the Ibero-American finds outlet for his spiritual powers is in literature, criticism, poetry and eloquence. He has a sure sense for the fine phrase. His rich imagination supplies him with sparkling symbols. He loves irony and clever sarcasm. When he finds the average American's inability to express himself with fresh, titillating metaphors and allusions, he spontaneously feels superior and looks down on the pedestrian American whom he considers to be a cultural moron. This feeling is strengthened when the Latin compares his own wide though surface interest in all the arts. He hears and discusses music, watches the ballet, looks at painting and sculpture, frequently trying his own hand at them. What he does not know is that he is only imitating the latest thing which came from Paris. He can be ignorant of this fact because since he does not copy he thinks that he is being original. Except for Mexico where a national painting group has evolved and does original work, the other countries imitate just as their forefathers imitated the Baroque art brought to them by the Spaniards and the Portugese.

All these observations point to the ubiquitous presence of emotion and passion in the Latin-Americans. When he reads poetry, he declaims it. When he meets his friend, he will embrace him. When he feels euphoric or sad, he expresses his feeling openly. Tears, laughter, song—often all three together—show up at any time. Courtesy and manners are highly esteemed in Ibero-America, and they can be impressive for their formal dignity and gravity. Even boys and youths will manifest these qualities. Yet at any moment stylized behavior will break down to permit the expression of feeling.

Emotions can be reduced, perhaps, to two dominating feelings: love and hate. These are certainly the two forces which dominate Latin-America. Reason is not the moderator of the emotions but rather their tool. Highly rational as the Ibero-American is, he yet does not subject his feeling to the judgment of reason. If he loves you, you can do no wrong. If he hates you, you can do no right. He loves easily, but there is a test through which the beloved must pass. Once passed, the love remains usually for life. Friendship is perhaps the highest value of the south. It is also beautiful.

The loyalty, the sacrifices, the support which Latin-American friendship bring are moving things to experience. Love is not hidden. It is shown on every occasion, sad, joyous or ordinary. Once you have entered into a Latin-American friendship you gladly surrender yourself to these people, so charming, so attractive, so heart-breaking. If a man has been received into this friendship, his life has been enriched and transformed.

Integrity

Here let us end our description of the Latin-American soul. Synthetically we can say that the Latin-American believes that life is something subjectively to be enjoyed rather than an opportunity for objective creation. He seeks ecstatic transport rather than prosaic comfortable living. He detests anything which tries to curb his individualistic desires. He is highly rational but he puts emotion over reason. Love is the great value. The result is that we have a being completely logical in the abstract yet totally illogical in the concrete. His is the grand gesture, prodigality, no concern for tomorrow, consumption rather than production, spontaneity and winsomeness. He is Don Quixote and Sancho Panza simultaneously; sometimes one is to the fore, sometimes the other. He is not immoral, but his morality demands self-expression. Integrity, being one's self totally and always, is the high moral demand. Self-discipline which wishes to suppress the self is the highest form of immorality. It is hypocrisy, a thing which the Latin-American cannot stand. . . .

* * *

I met Fr. Weigel so often during the Council and I know how important his theological influence was in the United States especially. Precisely in the decisive phase, the Catholic Church of the United States lost with him one of her most courageous thinkers.

HANS KÜNG
University of Tubingen

THE NATURE OF THE CHURCH

In his twenty-seven years of teaching, Gustave Weigel lectured and wrote textbooks on practically every area of theology, from the psychology of religion to the Orthodox Churches. During his most productive years, however, he was Professor of Ecclesiology at Woodstock College, the rural Maryland theologate where he had made his own philosophy and theology, and where he returned in 1948. His missionary experience had profoundly widened his understanding of the Church. The intensive study he plunged into at Woodstock upon his return deepened his own historical framework and spurred on his own conviction that the Church badly needed a relevant, updated, more adequate explanation of itself in the modern world. It was a subject he remained close to until his death. When he came home from the close of the first session of Vatican II in 1962, he was very dispirited over the conservative, hierarchical-oriented early schema of the constitution of the Church. Unfortunately his untimely death in January, 1964, prevented him from witnessing the final redaction of Lumen Gentium, *that remarkable document which summed up much of what he had been foreshadowing about the nature of the Church.*

These foreshadowings can be discerned in the three selections here included. "Missions and Ecclesiology" most likely dates from the mid-fifties. "The Role of the Layman in the Church" was delivered to the Catholic Family Movement at their Denver Convention in July, 1960. The final paper, "Current Ecclesiology and Canonist Ecclesiology Compared," was one of his last public addresses on the theology of the Church.

Missions and Ecclesiology

From the ecclesiology of St. Paul to the ecclesiologies of our day the Church has been described as something universal. In the Nicene Creed this aspect of the Church is expressed by the word Catholic. However, the word Catholic is a very ambiguous term. As has been shown, the word in the first four centuries did not have a geographical but a logical meaning. It meant "according to its essence," so that it could be translated as the truly genuine church, the church faithful to its essential concept in contrast to false churches. Universality in this context means that church of which the universal idea of Christ's Church could be rightly predicated.

In the fifth century the word took on a different meaning, especially after the work of St. Augustine. Catholic began to mean ecumenical, the one church in its world-wide existence in contrast to a particular church, let us say of Africa or Asia Minor. It is this latter sense which is the basis for current understandings of ecumenism. Catholic is no longer abstract as it was in Nicaea, but refers to a concrete, unique, geographically unlimited fellowship to be met in the world and history.

Catholicity, understood in either of the significations mentioned, of itself says nothing about missionary activity. However, such action is implied. The expansiveness of the Church is an implicit part of the Pauline concept of universality. In Paul the Church is for all men and it is for this reason that those who have not heard the good news need heralds who will proclaim it to them. Since Paul was overwhelmed with the hope that Christ would come soon, there was an urgency in the man. He was anxious that the proclamation be quick. His tireless impatience is explained by the fact that he thought that there was but little time.

The Pauline urgency was relaxed as the centuries went by. One motive for the diminution of tension was the Augustinian assumption that the good news had already reached all men. This assumption was based on the ignorance of geography and on the identification of culture with the ways of the Mediterranean basin. The Church by the time of the fifth century was a massive fact in

the Roman Empire and the fusion of Church and Empire was an actuality. True, there were pagans and heretics still about, but their presence proved man's bad will and not a lack of proclamation of salvation. It was well known that in the east there were peoples beyond the Roman Empire, but it was presumed that these too had heard the gospel.

The first Germans who infiltrated the Roman Empire were not pagans. They were Arians. As heretics they had to be called to penance. They had to be made, not Christians, which they already were, but Catholics which meant authentic Christians. This was not true by the 7th, 8th and 9th centuries. Saxons, Slavs and Bulgars had to be made Christians and the monks of the east and the west took on the job of proclaiming the gospel to them. These barbarians were to be genuinely incorporated into the Christian society which they had either penetrated or to which they wished to be annexed. The supposition was always that the Church was the Roman Empire, even when in the west it was necessary to make a new Roman Empire for the purpose.

The 15th and 16th centuries saw the collapse of European religious unity and the opening of the large world beyond the European peninsula. In this era began what today we call missions. The missionaries were Europeans and it is not strange that they identified the Church with the European institution. They went everywhere but everywhere they latinized in all good faith. An ecclesiological presumption was at work. The genuine Church was European at least in spirit and in culture.

The situation demanded a new study of the ecclesiological principle that the Church was Catholic. But what did Catholic mean? Here was the crux of the problem. Spontaneously the first missionaries, not least of all St. Francis Xavier, understood the word very concretely. Catholic meant adherence to the very local church of the western Mediterranean. There were in those days missionaries who realized that this was ecclesiologically false but they could not put their finger on the fallacy. They realized that church unity did not mean church uniformity, but they did not have a clear and distinct concept of catholicity. European colonialism did not help them to clarify their thought. Christian meant to them Mediterranean and anything not Mediterranean in culture or faith by that very fact could not be genuinely Christian.

Rethinking

With the death of colonialism a rethinking of catholicity became possible. Work is being done now, though it still is only fragmentary and experimental. I think that we are vaguely glimpsing that catholicity is a word denoting both inward depth and outward stretch. The word must be taken not as a sheer name but as a dynamism vitalizing the Church of God. Catholicism is not merely a profession of faith but much more a propulsion to action. As we see its history in theology, we can say that it means universality in terms of orthodoxy, proclamation, ecumenism and absorption.

We might do worse than examine each of these elements. That universality should mean orthodoxy may strike the modern hearer as strange. Yet as we have seen, this was the first meaning of catholicity for the early Church. All of the revelation must be accepted in its entirety. There must be no picking and choosing. Such things were the marks of heresy and denied catholicity. To be Catholic means to receive humbly the saving truth of God with no arrogant attempt to make a faith of our own. Nor must we deny a part of the revelation either through conscious intent or unconscious neglect. Not only must we accept the truths of revelation from our hierarchs who are divinely capacitated for their task but we must likewise protest when they do not give us the fullness of the divine message. We must be Catholics, that is, desirous of *all* the truth of God. A partial truth can be a half truth and, thus, half a lie. We want all the truth not merely for the individual self but for the whole Body of Christ which is the Church.

The element of orthodoxy in catholicity is its first demand. A cavalier attitude to sacred doctrine cannot be Catholic. Exclusive preoccupation for action to the neglect of vision is the best way of losing catholicity. No action is good unless it conform to the idea of the good, and contemplation of the idea is therefore the first requisite incumbent on the Catholic. Christ is indeed the way, but he is the way to the degree that he is the truth on which is based his life. In this Johannine dictum we can see that the truth cannot be merely abstract meditation but a meditation that springs from life and overflows into life. It is not mere science which looks only for inner logical consistency but it is rather wisdom which seeks for more than consistency by demanding coherence with action. A Catholic does not only know the truth; he must also do the truth.

It is precisely because true catholicity is orthodox in thought and deed that proclamation is inevitably an essential element of catholicity. Scripture and tradition insist that the genuine Christian, the Catholic, must give witness to what he has seen and heard. Christianity is not a flight from the world. It is always a voice to the world, so that even the hermits have a witnessing factor in their retirement. The hermitage is a light on the mountain which gives its illumination to those on the plain.

It is here where the missionary enterprise comes to the fore. Since the Catholic is necessarily witness-bearing, his witness to those beyond the Church is missionary. There are different theories as to the essential definition of the missionary action but that question does not affect our present reflections. The witnessing nature of the Christian commitment is clearly expressed in the words of the Marcan gospel, "Go out to every part of the world and proclaim the Good News to the whole creation." Every Catholic is a witness wherever he be, and his witnessing is done by word and act; but there is also the outgoing nisus in the Catholic so that he will go out "to the ends of the earth." Not every Catholic will be in a situation where such outgoing will be possible for him, but in the total Catholic Church there will be those who can, and when they can, they must by reason of the catholicity in them. The Church would cease to be Catholic were this not true.

This very point of outgoing witness brings up the element of ecumenism. In our time that word has undergone a change of nuance, but not a change of substance. One of the key notions of ecumenism is the recognition of the Church of Christ as an historical world-wide fellowship. The ecumenical Church is something to which the local church must conform, in which it has its own life, to which it must contribute local effort. The oneness of the Church in the whole world is professed in the claim to catholicity.

It has been said that the Eastern Orthodox stress the reality of the Church in the local community while Roman Catholics always conceive the Church as a world-wide reality to the detriment of the autonomy and vitality of the local parish. There is always some truth in such generalizations, and I think that Roman Catholics do feel the wholeness of the universal Church very strongly. Our

episcopal organization with the Bishop of Rome as its center and head, makes even our parish life broader than its parochial limits. Of course we are parochial with all the smallness which that term implies, but there is a catholic antibody which prevents parochialism from becoming a deadly disease.

I believe that this can be best seen in the American and European effort to supply the Latin American Church with the clergy and religious whom it so badly needs. Whether this is strictly speaking missionary, I do not know. I do know that in my eleven years in Chile I never once felt that I was a missionary. Yet be the effort missionary or not, it certainly is ecumenical. It implies a refusal to identify the Church of God with the circle of Catholics in the United States and it manifests a conscious feeling of oneness with the Church in a land not one's own. At the moment almost 2000 American clerics and religious are working to aid the hierarchy of Ibero-America. This is minuscle assistance to a belabored church but it is augmented by the generosity of other churches in the Catholic world. The critical condition of the Latin American church does rouse the ecumenical consciousness of Catholics everywhere. This is as it should be, or better, there should still be more of this good thing. The ecumenical factor in catholicity makes the Christian obey the Pauline demand that one member of the mystical Christ suffers when another suffers, and he does all he can to bring healing.

Full stature

Ecumenism is not a static conception. It implies more than the realization that the believer belongs to a world church. It also says that it is a church growing in the world. In the Pauline image, the Church is constantly growing in maturity and extension until it achieves the full stature of Christ. Church witness must necessarily go beyond the confines of its achieved reality. The going beyond is the missionary action. In this light, we must recognize that the function of the missionary is primarily ecclesiological, and only secondarily eschatological. The old slogan according to which the missioner saves souls is not altogether happy nor even theologically correct. The missioner is helping the Church to grow and it is the Church which saves. Men are called to more than the acceptance of creeds and dogmas. They are called to a life in the Church. Such

a calling means community, liturgy, dialogue, and hierarchy. Such a life is local and also ecumenical.

It has been said, and perhaps unjustly, that Francis Xavier was a bad missionary. The accusation rests on the fact that he moved like a whirlwind through Asia. His critics say that he baptized with the exclusive desire that individuals be liberated from their sins. Once this was done, he moved on. The ideal of Xavier according to such observers was to baptize as many men as possible, without realizing that the first effect of baptism is to incorporate the individual into the mystical but visible society which is the Church. I believe that careful historians are trying to show that Xavier did not suffer from such myopia. If indeed he did, then it would be true that his missionary rationale was bad. The missionary tries to be an instrument of God's grace by putting men into the Catholic community. He is as much interested in community as he is in the individual, and it is true to say that he is interested in the individual only in so far as he can be an element of a society.

Ecumenism is catholicity under the aspect of wholeness. Now wholeness is, as we have seen, not only the wholeness of what is but also the wholeness yet to be. Catholicity is therefore absorptive. It goes out to bring in elements which are still lacking. Catholicity says openness.

We must understand this openness correctly. The Church is not merely open to new members who must become uniform with the structure of the local church from which the missionary comes. The Church is also open to the way of life proper to the newcomer. He is not called upon to relinquish his culture by reason of his vocation to the Church. Rather, the Church is called upon to absorb his cultural conditioning. The Church is a human body according to St. Paul. This body is a unity with immense variety. It is unity without uniformity, it is a unity which absorbs differences without destroying them. In order to achieve the full growth of the Body, the Church must take on all the cultural achievements of humanity. The Fathers of the Church teach that when God assumed humanity, it was his intention to be the universal man. Physically this is not possible for any individual because his very individuality is rooted in one point of time and space. By reason of Christ's intention to be the universal man, he needed the filling out of his individuality through the Mystical Body.

Man is a sinner because of the heritage of the common father, Adam. Not all in man can be absorbed into the Mystical Christ, for Christ is without sin. Yet things which are not sinful can be assimilated and must be. Differences of sex, age, place, and culture are to be adopted organically in the Church. The consequences of this absorption are many and profound. In Africa a highly developed art form is the dance. If the Church wishes to fulfill its obligation to absorb all that is beneficently human, the dance will play a large role in African church-life. Hindu predilection for meditation should make the Indian Church meditative. Liturgy, which is the communal worship of the Church, will take on different shapes in different lands. The basic sacramental structure will be the same everywhere but the flowering of it will show the differences of soil and climate. Greek and Latin liturgies are particular forms proper to those cultures but they are not universal.

In like manner the question of canon law must be resolved in the light of cultural diversity. The fine Roman legal mind is Roman. It is not universal. Many peoples have greater trust in unwritten customs than in written laws. Likewise Greek logic is only one form of thought and communication. There are other forms existing in the world. In fact logical communication, granting all of its advantages, is not the only way to express truth. Image and symbol language has its advantages too, and these advantages might be more congenial to men not of the west.

In our day we have learned that Gothic architecture is hardly suited to a Chinese country side. A Japanese Madonna and Child have many virtues not to be found in Raphael. Have we learned as well that the western inclination to tight organization may in certain circumstances be inferior to a leisurely disorder? After all, the crucifix speaks eloquently without the aid of a clock.

In a single word, our catholicity is constantly searching for more modes of self-expression; it is not committed to cultural monism. Catholic life is wide open to endless forms of manifesting itself.

My considerations have been strictly ecclesiological. We have seen that catholicity includes four notions: orthodoxy, proclamation, ecumenism and absorption. I do not identify myself with the missionary fraternity, but I am sure that what I have said can be spelled out concretely by the missionaries. In fact, they will have to do so in order to be Catholic.

The Role of the Layman in the Church

The question that is before the house at least was referred to the right department to discuss it even though the representative of the department may not be the best that you can get. You are dealing with the role of the layman in the Church. I think the substantive word there is Church. And the Department of Theology in which I work is called Ecclesiology, which means the theological theory of the Church. It is precisely in the line of this theory that we can make a serious and valuable judgment concerning the role of the laity. Now, before we go any farther, it is well to bring out that the Church has a structure of its own and this structure is only partially brought forth by Canon Law; that is a very changeable thing. The Church is a human reality, indeed, but formed and framed by Christ Himself. Consequently, if we want to know what the Church is, we must look at her in her theological reality and especially in her basic reality, which the theologians call mystical. She is the Mystical Body of Christ.

Now theologians work in a common way. They try to make intelligent and intelligible affirmations after a study of Christ's revelation. Christ's revelation is mediated to us in two ways: in the scripture, as that scripture is transfused by the Church's abiding tradition. The theologian picks up the scripture, as transfused by and embodied in tradition, and mediates in words the thoughts of theology. These are means that the Church has whereby she teaches the people.

The grasping of the revelation, however, is not a verbal enterprise at all. It is an enterprise of the total man. Nevertheless, for him to reach this invisible and, to a degree, inevitable message from God, he must use words. Now words in revelation are different from words which are used, for example, in mathematics or in a scientific description. In a scientific description, when we are told this or that is oxygen, we expect it to be as oxygen is everywhere and anywhere. This is not true of words which are used to convey the revelation of God and his Christ. These words are symbols.

What do we mean by symbol words? They are analogical words; words which are used in terms of similarity. When we speak of the

Church as being the Body of Christ, we are not trying to make any kind of affirmation in terms of anatomy and physiology. We understand the Church in the light of the analogy with a human body; therefore, that which is described is known and described imperfectly because it is described not in its own terms, but in terms which are proper to something else. To understand a symbol, which is an expression of divine revelation, we must, of course, be in residence with revelation. The greater the faith of the individual, the deeper his commitment to the revelation of God in His Christ, the better he will understand the symbol. Our superficial understanding may be brilliant but deep understanding is only to be found in those who are pious and virtuous.

This afternoon let us discuss certain symbols which revelation uses to describe the Church. In discussing these symbols, we can find out the generic principles of the role of the layman in the Church. One of the most obvious and most frequent symbols which the New Testament, and especially St. Paul, uses to describe, to make known to us the nature of the Church is the phrase, 'the people of God'. In the Greek, St. Paul uses the phrase "laos tou Theou." Now the word "laos," which in Greek means "people," is also the word from which we get laity, and *laique*. The laity and the *laique* person belong to the "laos." That is to say, in our context, the "laos tou Theou" or the people of God.

When the Church is so described as "the people of God," we notice that there is no differentiation whatsoever between the members of that people of God. In that people of God, we, indeed, find the hierarchy; in that people of God, we find Christ Himself. And in the context of the symbol of the people of God, not only the hierarchy but even Our Lord, are *laique*—are laity. Therefore, there is a sense in which the Church is the laity, and the Church is *laique*, and the laity are the Church. And in this sense Laity includes not only the people without orders, but all the orders of the hierarchy and even Our Lord Himself.

One great mistake that has been made in the past in the study of a doctrine is, to use only one of the symbols of revelation that deal with the doctrine. The New Testament and the constant tradition afterwards use many symbols for the same thing. And this is necessary. Any one symbol brings out only part of the truth

of the thing symbolized. The multiplication of symbols brings home more and more the many dimensions of the thing deseribed—Church, Christ or God Himself.

The body of Christ

Let us eonsider another symbol of the Chureh which is so important in the New Testament and so important in modern theology. It is the symbol of the Body of Christ. If you read the Epistles of St. Paul, you will notice the eonstant reiteration of the Church as the Body of Christ. Here we find the Church deseribed in terms of two divisions, and only two, head and members. A speeial place is given to Christ, the Head, in this Body. Remember always that Christ, the Head, is not outside the Body. Christ, the Head, is in the Body. But there is a distinction between the high plaee of Christ, who gives meaning, life and direetion to the total Church, His Body, and the members. This is the great division that Paul makes and to whieh modern theology gives so mueh stress.

Once more we have the Church deseribed, now in terms of a subordination: the subordination of all Catholies, to Christ, the Head, who lives in the Chureh and whose trunk the Chureh is. Such is the symbol and image of Paul. The Body, he means, is the trunk, as we frequently say of an athlete. We see him running down and we say "a splendid body." We are not looking at his head at all. We're looking at his trunk. And so, too, Paul coneeives the body of the Chureh as the trunk of Christ, the Head. However, in the people of God, who make up the trunk, there is no differentiation whatsoever.

All members are considered to be of equal value, of equal meaning, beeause they are members of Christ, beeause they are all Christ's. And they do the work and aetion of Christ in the world. After his resurrection, they are so thoroughly united with him that when Our Lord said to the perseeuting Saul, "Saul, Saul, why perseeuteth thou, Me?," we see that in perseeuting them, no matter what be their plaee in the hierarehy of funetion, it was Christ who was being perseeuted. And Saul, later Paul, saw this great truth from the moment of his eonversion.

But this Body is his Body, his trunk; it's not as our Protestant friends so frequently seem to think, an amorphous blob of protoplasm. It's a body; it's organized. Different members are struetured

differently for the good of the whole. Not only that, these different structures interlock. You can't have one without the other. Yet, one is not better than the other in terms of dignity. They are different one from the other in terms of function. St. Paul is anxious to point this out in the First Epistle to the Corinthians: "If the ear says 'I am not an eye, I am not a part of the body', that does not make it any less a part of the body. If the body were all eye, how would we hear?" Nor is one part better than the other; all are needed to make a perfect body. There is, therefore, a hierarchy of function. Different functions belong to this body and consequently there will be different structures within the members so that all the functions can properly be realized.

There are, indeed, certain organs of the body, which we can say are more important than others for the functioning of the total body. I can cut off the arm of a man and he will not die. He will live and continue to work. He has lost, indeed, one function but the whole body can still work minus that function. If, however, I remove his heart or his brain he would function no more. In terms of function, not in terms of dignity, the heart and brain are more important. There is a subordination of the other organs to these higher organs; higher in terms of function. This is the notion of hierarchy. I should rather imagine that a physiologist and an anatomist must not be pleased with the valentine card. For him, the heart is a tough muscle and he could no more conceive sentiment and love attached to it than he could conceive it associated with the big toe. The way the heart is made and the big toe is made does not even give any distinction in terms of dignity between them. But in the function of the total body, more depends upon the heart than on the big toe. Therefore, in the very symbol of the Mystical Body, where the division is made between Christ, the Head, and all the rest as members, there is also insinuated this distinction of organ from organ in terms of function so that there will be a functional subordination of some organs to another. Consequently we see that the notion of the hierarchy is very clearly proposed to us in the body symbol. There is a hierarchy; it is not that the hierarch is of better stuff, of better intelligence, of greater piety than the rest of the members. But the hierarch does have a principle and a power within him given by the Holy Ghost, which makes the whole body

alive, in order to coordinate the action of the body so that it will be the action of Christ risen again; the action of Christ upon the world in which we live.

Now let me summarize what we have seen so far. We ean, indeed, describe the Chureh in sueh a way that differentiation between member and member need not be expressed. Where a basie unity will be had among all. All are of the people of God. And there is no differentiation there between the members.

I can also express the truth of the Chureh in the great pauline symbol of the Mystieal Body of Christ. Here we stress a division and a distinetion: the division between Christ, the Head, and the visible Church as the trunk; a distinetion—by—funetion among the members who make up the trunk. It is in this funetional distinetion that we find the hierarehy.

Hierarchy, therefore, is something within the Chureh and properly there by its essence. By the strueture which Christ Himself gave, the hierarchy must be present. But as we see from the other symbols, it is not neeessary to be stressing hierarehy all the time. We can with equal right and with justifieation from revelation, affirm the equality of all the people within the Chureh. We ean stress and affirm this equality but we must never deny, that within it there is and must be a funetional eoordination in terms of subordination of organ to organ.

One with Christ

Now, in terms of such a unified strueturing of the Church, living the life of Christ on earth, we understand the Chureh anybody's as plaee in it. To be in the Chureh means that you are in Christ. You share his power. You share his grace. You share his mission. He was the priest and so we are all a holy priesthood because we are the Body and live with the life of Christ, the priest. He was king and so to use the words of the Epistle of St. Peter, "we are a kingly people." And we are all-powerful kings. He was a prophet and, therefore, we are prophetic beeause we are the Body of the great prophet. He was the sanetifier and we are sanetifiers beeause we have the one life with him; we have the one mission with him. He was also vietim who went on to suffering and death and we, with him, are vietim and must go on to suffering and death. And as St. Paul brings out, if we are one with him in all these things,

we are equally one with him in his final resurrection which was the culminating glory of the work of this God-man on earth.

We must work as one, for one we are in the Christ. And that bring us, then, to the question of the coordination of action through the subordination of parts to part. It is the hierarchy which has as its function the coordination of the multiple activity of the Church. It coordinates precisely in that it has a superiority of function which requires in others a subordination to it as a superior organ, superior in function and not in dignity. How does the hierarchy achieve this special position within the Church? Through the Holy Ghost as mediated to the individual bishop by the imposition of hands of the hierarchy which preceeded him. It is the bishop who is the hierarch. Indeed not, with the perfect fullness of Christ, the Head, but with the fullness of the power which Christ, himself, placed within his Church. To be a member of the hierarchy means principally and essentially to be a bishop. All the other orders, the priests, the deacons, the sub-deacons, and so forth, were later established by the Church. In them the episcopal power was given not in its fullness, but in part, so that those who have that partial power might assist and aid the bishop in his own multivarious world.

Hierarchy, therefore, means primarily, essentially, the bishops. Of all these bishops, there is one who, in his own individual personality, has the fullness of episcopal power. All the others have that power in union with him and through participation. This hierarchy is the coordinating principle within the Mystical Body. The Body is something alive; something of its very nature nervous, which is always in residence and dynamic with its head in terms of action. It is not a dead body. It's alive with the resurrection of Christ, himself. Therefore, the hierarchy does not give life. The life is already there in the body. The hierarchy coordinates life, the life which is there. The power to act in the Church does not come from the hierarchy. It comes to every Catholic from the sacraments. By Baptism he belongs to the Church and shares in her life and has a right to all the sources of life—the sacraments. By Confirmation he is divinely empowered and directed to do more than live off the bounty of Christ, rather to be with him through all the world in all the work of the saving love of God.

Confirmation does not differentiate the Christian's task in the Church. It is undifferentiated in terms of actions of witnessing, including the supreme act of witness, martyrdom, which the Christian may be called upon to perform. Peculiar types of action are given by two other sacraments. More specific than that given by confirmation, which is general, orders will give the individuals receiving them the sacred power, action of the Church. The ordained's action is within the Church. Keeping it united; keeping its action coordinated; keeping its action true to Christ, the Head. And Matrimony puts the Christian in contact with the world at large where the matrimonial vocation must be carried out. He is given the power and obligation to bear the witness of Christ to the outer world. He stands between the inner light of the Church and the outer light of the world. In the married man and woman, the Church and the Mystical Christ meet.

Now it is quite clear that even the layman, with the empowering of marriage or only with the general empowering of Confirmation, must be capable of initiative and must exercise that initiative when the occasion requires it. This initiative itself is not something arbitrary, whimsical, in him. It is the product of the instinct of the body, the instincts given by the Holy Ghost; we call them the fruits of the Holy Ghost. These are instincts and, given the proper stimulus, the layman will respond. Do you know how it works in life, in the body which we have? If there is a danger to the eye, you blink. This kind of thing can be found in the body of Christ. Certain stimuli approach the individual member and for his functioning he responds by the instinct given to him by the Holy Ghost.

Therefore, the principle of hierarchy, the principle of coordination through subordination of member to member does not in any way whatsoever exclude in the life of any of the members the power and obligation of following initiative, the instincts; of the Holy Ghost stimulated by the world in which we live. Such are the general theological principles referring to the function of the laity in the Church.

We have, however, in our time, a special problem. The new world is new. The situation of 1960 is revolutionary. It is quite unlike the world of 1900. Consequently, the relationship of the action of laity and hierarchy must be seen in the light of the new world. Let us

see some of the elements which produce this novel situation requiring a novel working-out of the relationship between hierarchy and laity.

Pluralism and revolution

There were, only sixty years ago, countries which could be called Catholic, countries which could be called Protestant, countries which were Buddhist. Today that is not true. All world communities, with the possible exception of Tibet, and that seems to be an exception no more, are pluralistic. The people who make up these communities are not one in their concept of life, man and destiny. We have different views. The result is that these communities live and work through a consensus because without consensus they could not live and work (which is either anti-Catholic or non-Catholic). This is a world-wide situation. No country can be excluded, neither Scotland, nor Ireland, nor Spain.

Secondly, in the light of this revolution, the institutions which were created by the Catholics in thoroughly Catholic societies, or in smaller defense ghettos, are no longer effective. Some of these older institutions have already disappeared. Others are still with us but working in a very halting fashion and everyone realizes it. And that is also true of the old public processions in which you wore bands and carried church banners. I don't see many of them anymore.

You can sense the changes in the books we read. The books that were read around there in 1900, they were all debating controversy with the adversary. When you read those books today, you feel as if you were in a lost lane. It's not the way that Catholics write today. That debating-controversy notion has given way to something else, to that much abused word, dialogue, which only means friendly conversation. In 1900, the Catholic schools had a structure which they haven't got any more. They were quite sure of themselves and so were the people at large. Today, the Catholic schools are looking for structure. They don't think they have it.

We are living in a revolutionary moment. World society and our own institutions are changing. We can see the change reflected in new approaches to old problems, in our own critical evaluation of our role in the new world. We can see the change in this meeting.

One thing we have noticed in your presence today here is a group.

The laity have manifested an eagerness to do something more than to assume the layman's posture of 1900. That was a simple posture as described by English Catholics. He was to be on his knees and his hand was to hover over the collection basket. To most of our Catholics today, that posture is too simple. Our Catholics today have been through all the forms of education which our time can offer. In most cases, as for example in our country, they're quite secure in their Catholic status; they're not on the defensive. They want now a holiness proper to their lives. They want to know theology. They want a program of responsible action. This can be seen in America. It can be seen in Europe; can be seen in Australia; everywhere we find the same phenomenon.

What is more, in the society in which we live, highly democratized as it is, it is necessary and inevitable that the Catholic layman take on functions of high importance for general society. When I was in college, it was almost unthinkable that a layman should teach philosophy in a Catholic college. Today in many Catholic colleges, almost all the Philosophy is taught by laymen. On my desk back home, I have a letter now, one of many, from a non-Catholic school asking me to name a layman who can teach Catholic theology in a non-Catholic college. Sisters' colleges are already asking for laymen to teach theology. Catholic laymen are the editors of Catholic journals. They are the editors, likewise, of non-Catholic journals. We were always in politics, especially those, shall we say, who had Celtic background and belonged to the Democratic Party. But today our men are more than politicians. They are statesmen. Men with large vision; men who can speak to their country and to the world. We have witnessed, therefore, in the last sixty years, a growth of the value of the Catholic layman. In the fields in which he is working, he has competed successfully with the clergy. In other fields where the clergy simply could not enter, he has become a respectable figure. This is a simple fact.

And, of course, we understand that it is the time of the expert. What makes an expert? Superior and specialized knowledge. Now it is impossible for the clergy to have superior and specialized knowledge outside of one or two fields. And it as been noted both by clergy and the laity alike, that our seminaries, so far from producing an expert, in even one field produce an individual who does not show a high understanding of what sci-

ence and scholarship are. The result is that in our parishes we have so many laymen who are far better educated than the priests who lead them in parish life and from the altar.

Theologians, again in our times, under the impact of liturgical movement, under the impact of the ecumenical movement, under the impact of the rise of the laity, now freely recognize that the Catholic reaction to the Protestant denial of existence of hierarchy in the Church actually made us underplay the meaning and role of the laity in Christ's Church. There is a recognition that not much has been made of the theology of the layman and theology for the layman in the past. And the task is hardly touched in our times.

As Catholics, we have a special problem in this whole field. It is not a doctrinal problem at all. It is a problem which we can discuss in our family reunion. It's the problem of the clergy themselves. Obviously, in a large body they must be few. There are only 50,000 priests in this country for 40,000,000 people. There's a paucity of priests. They cannot be everywhere; they cannot do everything. No matter how willing the horse, there is a certain amount of load which he cannot carry. That we all appreciate. But there's some things which annoy us, perhaps.

Difficulties

There seems to exist an insensitivity on the part of some clerics to what the laymen feel—thanks be to God, this is not true of all clerics. It is insensitivity for the movement of the hour in which we live. And this insensitivity becomes painful when we find the clergy working through a bureaucracy. You do not deal with an individual but, rather, with an invisible machine. And, unfortunately, as has always been true, some clerics show a domineering arbitrariness in their relationship to the laity who are, after all, of the people of God. Many who are not domineering or arbitrary, manifest a secretiveness. They won't tell you why we are doing certain things. Their motives are kept quite secret. They will ask support for a project, never indicating why the project is being undertaken, much less the means by which the project will be realized. And they become incensed if they are questioned.

And then, of course, in many, thanks be to God not in all, but in most, there is an unreadiness for open discussion of problems with the laity, the people of God. These things, of course, are not at all

necessary within the framework of the Church. On the other hand, I don't think we should be surprised or grievously scandalized by their presence. It is natural that men should so act. And although Catholic life is not natural, nature working under original sin is not eliminated from the Church. It is the Church, indeed, of Saints; it is the Body of Christ but also the Mother of sinners.

Perhaps one of the difficulties that is most irritating for the laity who are now seeking for a much greater role in the total life of witness in the Church, is ambiguity in the leadership of the hierarchy itself. Hierarchy rather than clergy. They hear that lay action is what is required. They hear that this is the hour of the layman. In that more lay collaborative activity is required. And this pleases the layman, indeed. But he soon finds out that when he wants to take initiative, be responsible in movement, so far from being encouraged he is discouraged even to the point of repression; there is an ambiguity in the situation.

Again, this is certainly not according to the plan of Christ but it is certainly a manifestation of original sin with which you must be patient. Perhaps one field in this country, more so than in others, is a constant source of irritation. The Catholic schools, which are meant for lay folk, are completely controlled and dominated by clergy. The laity have no decisive or even highly influential role in the making out of programs, dictating policies, selection of personnel, and suggesting of studies. We know there is already a change with respect to this question; but only a small beginning has been made, a shadow of things yet to come.

On top of all this, our Catholic layman finds himself surrounded by a questioning world; a world that wants answers not from the Catholic priest but from the Catholic layman himself. Daily, hourly, he is being asked for opinions, asked for explanation of his stand. Fortunately we have seen in our own times laymen coming forth and doing this work, not only well, but with impressive excellence. I imagine most of us here saw the birth-control dialogue in which we had Colin Clark speaking, a man prepared, who could handle himself with dignity, propriety and friendliness, making, of course, a tremendously deep impression on all who heard him. More recently in one of those "Open End" programs you had the two Catholic laymen, Gene McCarthy and Bill Clancy, giving the

Catholic position with accuracy, with the proper note of friendliness, with security. Of course, the laymen are going to be asked for more of these from here on out.

So we have a real problem of the laymen's role in the concrete situation in which we are; a real problem. I think that the little collaboration I gave to God's grace has allowed me to tell you what's wrong but I can never tell you how to make it better. Therefore, I think that you should discuss among yourselves these problems which I have suggested; the principle I laid down in the beginning, which is the principle of theology. Let it be light for you in your own work to make the layman the proper active instrument in the Church which, indeed, he should be.

Initiative in the call

The call for the layman to give the world witness to God, to act in Christ is genuine. This call will be answered, first, by filling self and home with greater union with Jesus, our Head, through sacramental grace and meditation on Christ's revelation. This, in a word, is Christian sanctification, through sacramental liturgy and prayer. Properly enlivened by this dynamism, each Catholic, cleric or layman, will follow the instinctive guidance of grace in making Christ's message known. The layman must not be afraid of taking initiative even though he holds firmly to the principle of subordination to hierarchy. His initiative, even if it should meet with the repression of hierarchy, may yet exercise the prophetic function in the Church. The Christian ideal is that the whole people of God take its authoritative teaching from the hierarchy, and from the same hierarchy alone seek the sacraments of grace. In the Church's prophetic function of witness, hierarchy and people work together in harmony. Initiative can come from either side, though the hierarchy has the right and obligation to judge if the instinct behind the initiative was aroused by the Holy Spirit or some spirit not of God.

Let me add one simple postscript: it is not the function of the Church to make the world Catholic; it is not the function of the Church to create a priest in civilization; it is not the function of the Church to have the whole world kneeling at the Church's altar—that is a mystery of salvation in the mind and heart of God alone. And it seems to me that scripture and tradition point to the

fact that the Church will never get the world into it's own fold—the little fold—until the end of time when a new world will be made, not by man's power, but by the exclusive, supernatural power of God. The world is the place where the Church gives witness and this witness, it is hoped, will be the salvation of men of good will. We give witness. I, personally, do not expect the world to receive it.

* * *

He gave a glimpse of the Catholic Church (and of the Society of Jesus) which we shall always treasure. The mixture was unique: a rather formidable exterior, an unfailing courtesy and kindness, an almost intimidating learning, and a most lively wit. It was all of a piece—humanity, humour, faith. How ill we can afford to miss him at this stage of the ecumenical dialogue.

HOWARD ROOT
Dean, Emmanuel College, Cambridge

Current Ecclesiology and Canonist Ecclesiology Compared

Ecclesiology, as we use the word today, is a formally theological discipline. Such a statement is meaningful in a day when precise distinctions are used to delimit specific disciplines. The Middle Ages felt no great need for the vigorous compartmentalization of knowledge. The greatest intellectual work of the medieval period is certainly the *Summa theologica* of St. Thomas Aquinas. Yet this formally theological work, containing a precise description of theological procedure in its first question, included philosophy, etymology, and law.

Of course, people can write rules for theological method, but they should not be surprised if they are not followed by their fellows in the theological brotherhood. The *Zeitgeist* has too much to do with the manner in which a discipline is organized, and this spirit is a wind. It bloweth where it listeth. According to our prejudices which we do not consciously adopt and of which we are often unaware, canonist theology was not valid, so that it really was not theology at all. Such was not the mind of the theologians who used the legal method. They would be surprised if they had heard any complaint.

But we today have complaints. The first thing which annoys us in the work of the canonists is their blithe assumption that western Christendom, a secular commonwealth in western Europe, was identical with universal Christianity. They did know about the eastern Church, and it caused them some difficulty. Their usual solution was that the easterners were schismatics but not heretics. Heretics are out of the Church, but non-contumacious schismatics are not. Schism is a sin, but only contumacity in schism bars one from the unity of the Mystical Body. Yet there were others who taught that long-standing schism necessarily induces heresy as a concomitant. At all events there was little consciousness of the eastern Christians in the medieval westerner, and even when he met them in the Crusades, his approach was hardly that of a brother.

The upshot, therefore, was the identification of the two cities, the city of God and the city of earth. The city of earth had disappeared; only the city of God was left. There was no deep recognition in the medieval mind that not all power was in the Church. Gelasius had said in his letter to the Emperor Anastasius that there were two powers in the world; but by the Middle Ages, especially in the Bull *Unam Sanctam* of Boniface VIII, the two had become one—they had become the Church. Hence the two swords of power were now in the Church. There were still two orders of life, the sacral and the secular, but the two cities had coalesced into the Church, and in it all power must be. Now there is a necessary consequence to this thesis. By it the Church cannot fail to be secularized and the civil community will be given a sacral status. Both of these corollaries deform the two distinct orders which are needed for human welfare. By birth no man is a Christian nor does grace destroy the natural which it needs to build on. To overlook these basic theological truths is bad theology. Its effects were seen every day in the Middle Ages. There was a never ending struggle between bishop and prince. The concept of the prince as the lay bishop, which was common in those days, hurt the people of God by confusing their religious and civil allegiances. The bishops who raised armies and even rode to battle with their troops to gain territories for their jurisdiction, or defeat the prince who was an enemy, hardly made the Church live up to the image of bride and groom which Paul used to show the loving unity of the Christ community. The complete unity of the Church and mankind is for us an eschatological hope and ideal. This side of the eschatological divide we cannot expect the two cities to be one.

The invalid identification of the Church and the civil community was innocently accepted. It was indeed the Church which civically organized the western world. The Germanic invaders destroyed the Roman commonwealth but could not erect a substitute. The only unifying force at hand was the Church. For her own sake she kept the people together civically and the bishop in order to defend his flock from dissolution had to become the civil leader as well. This was a passing vocation and quite accidental. But the medieval bishop was easily persuaded that the transitory vocation was permanent and he clung to it even when his civil mission had ended.

A false problem

What is worse, the faulty theological postulate of the canonist era bequeathed a false problem to future ages. Three hundred years of theologizing in a certain way cannot but affect the theological continuum even after the three hundred years have passed away. Much of the current dispute concerning the power of the Church in secular affairs is useless and irrelevant. But our own theological tradition did discuss this question heatedly and pass it on to later generation for whom the problem was different. No one today supposes that the Church and the civil community are one and the same thing, and yet on that supposition was the older theology made. The serious theologian must not only follow tradition but, above all examine it in order to separate the elements of revelation from the human fallacies which accrue to it. The historical tradition in contrast to divine tradition is like a catch of fish, some bad and some good.

The second element in canonist ecclesiology which annoys the ecclesiologist today is its all but exclusive preoccupation with pope, cardinals, and councils. Insofar as the lawyers dealt with legal questions primarily, there is little to complain about. The lawyer is a man of the law. That is right and fitting. However, the canonist was also theologizing, and the theologians followed his legal method. Now it is quite clear that canon law sees the Church only in its external aspect. *De internis non judicat lex,* is a principle which the lawyers themselves have erected. An adequate ecclesiology cannot restrict itself to the externalities of the Church. In fact ecclesiological investigation of the external is necessary only to the degree that the internal is thereby reached. The effect of canonist theology was that it externalized the Church, a most interior thing. In consequence, since pope, cardinals and councils were juridically important, we heard no mention of the millions of laymen who hidden in silence did not loom large on the screen of legal concern. Yet they were the living Church, the people of God, and the stones of the living temple of the Spirit. They could and did develop a piety which, often enough, was not in the least ecclesial. As long as the Church is understood to be pope, curia and council, there could be little that was churchy about their lives and works. The only lay folk who were honored with juridical canonization were the kings and queens of the different provinces of

Christendom: St. Louis of France, St. Elizabeth of Hungary, St. Edward the Confessor, St. Margaret of Scotland, St. Henry the Emperor, St. Stephan of Hungary, St. Wenceslaus of Bohemia, and the other royal figures. It would almost seem that even heaven is not so snobbish and the snobbery was only in the high selectivity of theologians and lawyers. Most of the Church was excluded from the ecclesiology of the times. The Church in those days was conceived in terms of the pope, his cardinals, his council, and his vassals, the good Christian princes.

Another shortcoming modern ecclesiology finds in the canonists is their low view of the essence of papacy. The pope is the center of episcopacy. In him resides the fullness of the episcopal charism, to be participated by the whole episcopate. As we are prone to say today, there is a collegiality involved in this service. Authority is given to the college, for otherwise it could not serve, but the authority was not to be conceived as worldly power or anything like it. To find the essence of papacy in supreme jurisdiction, simply ignored the charismatic nature of episcopate. It produces the pyramid image of the Church. On the top was the single papal point which rested on and somehow included the cardinals, who in turn rose above the bishops, who were the lords of the clergy in their sees, and these latter ruled the faithful who were an undistinguished mass at the bottom. There were strata of affiliation and stratum was severed from stratum. This, a completely static conception of the Church. Her life, the interplay of member with member, the overall but invisible animation of the indwelling Spirit of God, the heavy charismatic activity of Christian life, the ecclesiological dimension of sacramental operation, the liturgical vitality of the people of God; were factors which were not considered. Yet if these things do not enter into the picture of the Church, you deal only with a caricature of her but not with a true portrait.

The pope

The pope is not distinguished from all other bishops by the simple fact that he has supreme jurisdiction. He is distinguished by the fact that he is primatial center of a functional collegiate dimension of the Church. We must not cut the pope off from the episcopal college nor must we cut off the bishops from the people. They are fused into the tightest kind of organic unity. Nor must we give

specific essence to the episcopate in terms of jurisdiction, which is a secondary and relative characteristic of the pastoral office.

Something of this vision was not entirely lacking in the canonist tradition. They were groping for the expression of the corporate nature of the Church. They granted to the corporation rights which the pope himself could not ignore, much less cancel out. The right to survival as the Church of Christ, the right to well being as a corporation, were recognized by the lawyers, but their jurisdictional framework of thought, made them misunderstand the mode in which these rights were safeguarded. They had as an ultimate mechanism for Church stability, the ecumenical council. This idea need not be rejected *in toto*, but it must be understood as something different from a democratic jamboree. The power in the Church is the Holy Ghost and the power of the pope or the council is not a parallel power or powers. Pope and bishops can only externalize and communicate in socially effective forms the directions of the Spirit. That is what they are for. That is the charismatic mission which they have. They are the social instruments whereby the ineffable directives of the Spirit, who does not speak, come forth socially. This is not a legal framework, though legal images can explain it partially by way of analogy, but the analogy not only limps but falters badly. A biological analogy will serve better, but even it will only serve as a pointer rather than a definition. Only in analogy can we speak of the divine, and the divine is always infinitely more unlike than like its analogous counterpart; so taught Aquinas. Such is the function of analogy in theology,—to be a pointer to guide us in our vision, and limit our field of discourse.

Here is where the medieval ecclesiologists failed. They did not take the role of analogy seriously. They tried by might and main and with innocent presumption to squeeze all they could and wanted from an analogy. That such a procedure was dangerous did not seem to enter their awareness. They moved on without any doubt about the legitimacy of their rationale. Occasional qualms they suppressed spontaneously. This phase of canonist ecclesiology should be a warning to the ecclesiologist of any day, including our own. We must remember that no one analogy, be it scriptural, patristic or medieval, can achieve the total pointing function. All these analogies, and more yet to come, must be used to tell us truly but imperfectly what God's Church really is. She is a mystery,

and her mysteriousness can never be resolved. In faith we are born of her and in faith we cling to her. The theologian uses his very faith to achieve some degree of understanding, but his understanding, deep or shallow, never has the solidity which the faith itself has. Understanding is the theologian's service to the faith. Nor is it an attempt to produce a rational scheme of revelation where reason and reason alone is satisfied. Theology is not mathematics even when it deals with trinity in unity.

Today's needs

Perhaps observations of this nature are especially needed by ecclesiologists today. Those of us who were young in the early thirties fell under the spell of the Pauline image of the Mystical Body. There was strong opposition in some quarters toward the use of this analogy to explain the mystery of the Church. The older way was to take the words, "Kingdom of God," and promptly refer them to the Church without much or any delving into scripture to find out what meaning it had. Instead it was taken as if it meant simply commonwealth; once more a legalistic deduction was made. In this struggle, Pius XII came out in defense of the use of the image of the Body of Christ, and the newer way of doing ecclesiology was launched. Today the enthusiasm of those days has been lost and many think that we would do better if we chose some other of the many images of the Church which scripture uses. I do hope that the ecclesiologists who hold chairs today will not repeat the action of their fathers of a generation ago. There is no need of making the Body image do the main work in explaining the mystery of the Church. It does not seem to be privileged, even though St. Paul makes it central in his own thought. Should some other image be more appealing to our time, by all means let our time use it. The function of an analogy is to communicate an ineffable truth effectively. That image which is more effective should be the image analyzed. The efficacity of a symbol lies not in itself but rather in the concrete social environment where the Gospel is being preached. Not all images speak persuasively to all periods. Each era and each generation of an era must choose the analogies which it finds stimulating. What is not permitted, is the employment of categories which carry no excitement for those who hear the proclamation of the Gospel.

In line with this kind of thinking we can understand the late pope's insistence that our message be directed to the people of the world as they are. Ancient doctrines are not false because they are ancient. In fact we want only the ancient doctrine which was once and for all delivered to the saints. However, they must be proclaimed to a new generation, and the form of the proclamation must be suited to those who will hear it. The picture of the oriental despot might have been appealing to orientals three thousand years ago. It might have been in resonance with their anxieties. Today it is quite useless. Far from being appealing, the image is repelling for the men of today. We should avoid it, not because it does not contain some pointer elements but because these pointer elements cannot be grasped by the living men in the living now. Pope John XXIII wanted the present ecumenical council to speak in a way which would be relevant to today's men and women. Relevance is demanded not only in the Church's proclamation, but also in theology. The discussion of the unicity or multiplicity of souls informing a human being must have had relevance to the Christians of the 14th century, but to bring this discussion back to today's market place would be more than futile. This question has sunk into the deep abyss of unconcern. The unity of man is always a disturbing problem for our race, but the 14th century form of presenting it, does not speak to the current world.

Fortunately, this we can say for the canonist ecclesiologists of the Middle Age: they were relevant to their time. Law studies had made a deep impression on the contemporary mind and law had the glamor of a successful thing. It is no wonder that they used it as an analogy in their ecclesiological studies. The more mystical approach of the Fathers was not condemned; it was for the main part ignored. The older way was not destroyed; only relegated to the realm of piety. This was a kindness to us, because when the canonist way no longer pleased, we could find the older way in hymns, sermons and meditations. Nothing was lost, but so little was used.

Lack of history

Another shortcoming in the canonist doctrine on the Church is palpably the lack of historical interest. They write in a now which is not at all connected with the past. The origins of things in-

terested them only if the origins were recent. To go back into the remote times did not seem attractive. The point that struck them hardest was that in their day they had arrived. They were not worried how they got there. It is useless to say that they had no instruments whereby they could probe into the past. They had them, and a future age, because of interest, found them unused. An adolescent is not in search of his genealogy; he is too occupied with being himself fully. One defect of this utter modernity is that it takes the present too seriously. To do that means to lose a vision of the whole. An age's severest critic is history.

We can easily find the faults of an age not our own, but to see what is wrong now is not so easy. Yet a glimpse of legalistic ecclesiology will tell us what errors we must avoid. The lack of historical sense in the medievalists should make us nervously aware of what went before. We must spin out our schemes but they must be anchored in history; if not, they will be floating gossamer attached to no stable base. Good theology will have three anchor points. First of all, it will be consistent with its own principles. It must, therefore, be logical. This the men of the Middle Age understood. They relied perhaps excessively on logic. There is a danger in this virtue. Logic works with concepts which are univocal. To what degree an image can be reduced to a concept is hard to say. That I say that John is a fox, is no warrant for concluding that he has red hair. Aquinas showed that analogies can be used in reasoning, but he also showed that the conclusions are always analogous. But we must above all remember that analogies have a conventional structure which excludes much of what is to be found in the physical thing whose name is being used. Here our canonists were not so careful, and by their lack of caution, they caution us.

Nor is mere logic enough. Many systematic expositions are highly logical, but that only means they come to right conclusions, not necessarily to true ones. The propositions must be coherent with the sources, and this requires historical investigation. The canonists made much of the Church as a *societas perfecta*, but only by comparing that term with the reality of the Church as made manifest in the scripture and the historically born tradition, could they legitimately make affirmations. They were not used to such research, but that does not excuse us in our day.

Consistency and coherence are the first demands of good theologizing but something more is demanded. The theologian must be relevant to the age in which he is making his constructions. He must construct and reconstruct the perennial data. He must be given the liberty to use his imagination. He is not the mere repeater of what has been said before. He cannot be original in the basic message he has to relay, but he must be original in the form in which the transmission is made. In our breviaries the liturgical calendar is given according to the Ptolemaic rules of time computation. The result is inevitable in a Copernican age. We don't bother to read the instructions because they are useless baggage. The antiquarian may be interested, but even he does not give real significance to it.

Relevance

This question of relevance is most challenging. How far can we go in changing the forms and symbols of the past? We cannot make it all over again. We need continuity to keep us in one Church which is the Church of Christ. We are not free to set up an unending series of new and different formulas. Insistence on the coherence of our theology with the expression of the revelation in every bygone age will certainly keep us from going too far, but since change of formulation is called for, we must depend on the consent of the theological fraternity for our protection. If new expressions and new insights do not fit our moment in which all other contemporaneous theologians are living too, they will be dropped at once before they go too far. Nor will the slaughter of such ideas be gentle. Theologians have not been accustomed to deal gently with their colleagues. The word *odium theologicum* has not survived without reason. Perhaps we must fear not so much the appearance of catastrophic novelty in theology as much as the stubborn hostility toward any change whatsoever. Today we have left the medieval way of doing ecclesiology, but have we transcended the shallow logicalism of the polemical treatise on the Church of the last century? It is not only hostility to change which languidly keeps alive the older way of presenting the nature of the Church, but a radical inertia operative in all sons of Adam, be they theologians or not. It is inertia more than anything else which still grants a fossil life to an ecclesiological scheme which has lost any shred of relevance

to our day with its insistence on existence, liturgy, and ecumenics.

That last word will lead us into another dimension which was missing in canonist ecclesiology. There was nothing ecumenical about it, and it is difficult to see how there could have been. The dissenter had no room in the tight unity of the Middle Age community. He was not considered as an honest man with his own understanding of the Gospel. He was simply a perverse heretic who betrayed the Christian *res publica*. For his bad and mischievous will he was burnt by the secular arm. The Albigensians, the Cathari, and the Waldensians were destroyed by fire and sword. Perhaps this was the only safeguard which society then had for its own preservation. Perhaps a different policy would have been more beneficent for all of Europe. Today it is hard to tell.

Yet one thing is true. The medieval solution is utterly unworkable in our time, even were it a genuinely Christian response. We are faced with the existence of large communities of dissidents who sincerely profess their faith in Jesus Christ, as God and Savior according to the Scriptures in obedience to the Father, Son and Holy Ghost. To consider these millions in our midst merely as depraved heretics hardly meets with the approval of the Christian conscience. On the other hand, the notion of heretical doctrine is ancient in the Church, and the notion of the oneness of the Church includes the notion of doctrinal unity. Certainly, this principle was not even questioned by the medieval canonists. They made much of it. Yet they had a solution of the problem of change which their own legal inclinations suggested to them. The note of heresy for them was contumacity, not merely error. St. Thomas makes the distinction which is of far reaching consequences. He speaks of *error in fide* and *error circa fidem*. The distinction between the two was not in the element of being wrong. Both were errors. However, only error which was contumacious induced the brand of heresy. Bad will made the error killing, not the error itself.

Certainly, in current ecclesiology there is an attempt being made to put dissidents who are baptized and profess their baptismal dedication to the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, somehow within the Church. The slippery word is, *somehow*. This will require more investigation in the future, because a pure *somehow* is exasperating. One thing is clear; a merely juridical understanding of the Church

will never bring a solution. When an ecclesiastical canon says anathema to the defenders of propositions rejected by the Church formally and legally, legally such men are out of the Church. To find a unifying category which can have a believer legally out and yet truly in the Church, is one of the pressing tasks of our contemporary ecclesiologists.

One device is no longer viable. We used to excuse non-Catholics from the law on the grounds of invincible ignorance. The intent of the term was kindly but it does not flatter the non-Catholic when he hears it. This phrase will have to join countless others in the theological attic where outworn furniture is relegated.

A new apologetic

To finish our criticism of canonist ecclesiology in the light of the ecclesiology of our own day, let us conclude on a happy note. Canonist ecclessiology shared with its modern counterpart a lack of apologetic preoccupation. The jurists took their faith for granted, and not even fictitiously were they trying to make Catholics of those who were not. The fruits of such an attitude are visible. There was a serenity in their work, eliminating the nervousness and insecurity which our post-Tridentine tractates showed. This note can be detected in modern ecclesiology as well. It has no apologetic concern. It works *ex fide in fidem.* If an apologetic is contemplated at all, it will be in the way of a propaedeutic to the formally dogmatic treatise itself. Ecclesiology dogmatically still belongs to division labeled as Fundamental Theology, because it deals with the ground concepts of theological investigation: revelation, faith, church, scripture and tradition.

One could rightly say that there is still an apologetic tone in today's ecclesiology. However, the word no longer means what it meant seventy-five years ago. The term is shifty in its significance through the centuries. The Patristic apologists did not look or act like Wilmers, Felder, Dorsch or Boulanger. They lived up to the obvious meaning of apology; they defended the Church from false accusations. The apologetic of the 19th century was a much different effort. The apologists wished to show on natural evidence that Catholicism was the religion ordained by God. The humorous element in the task was that they never met the living adversary, but constructed one or reconstructed one who was around. With

this mental creation they conducted a chop-logic polemic. Apologetic in our age means something else again. The ecclesiologist keeps up a running dialogue with non-Catholic Christians. It is not a polemic and it is not a debate. Every effort is made to understand the genuine thought of the partner in conversation, including, above all, the postulates of the neighbor. The consideration of the neighbor's explicit statements without adverting to his initial assumption, or even worse, understanding his affirmations in terms of my own postulates, is no confrontation of minds. Today's dialogue is an essay to teach and to learn simultaneously. Debater's points are out of order.

In sum, therefore, we can say that canonist ecclesiology has elements in common with our ecclesiology, but by and large, the older effort was rather alien to what is being done today. However, it behooves us to look at canonist ecclesiology with greater care than we have shown in recent times.

* * *

Living under the intolerable burden of distress caused by the divisions among Christians, he has dedicated his life to the removal of barriers of misunderstanding. We thank God for his life.

BISHOP JOHN WESLEY LORD
Methodist Church

THE INTELLECTUAL LIFE

A Russian satellite in the fall of 1957 startled the United States into a frantic self-examination which ended with a critical finger being pointed at the competence and priorities of American education. Even before this momentous event had jolted Americans out of the post-Korean lull that had settled over the nation, Msgr. John Tracy Ellis had caused a minor furor among American Catholics by asserting that U.S. Catholics were not carrying their weight intellectually. Gus Weigel was soon caught up in the debate. He argued that Catholics could no longer shun the challenge of becoming fully involved within the intellectual community of the country. The base for meeting this challenge had to be laid in Catholic education. There could be no substitute —not even a religious one, for intellectual excellence as the main criterion for a school's purpose and worth. The school or college or university had to be "the social locus of scholarship, not a morally healthy environment, not a seminary of piety, not an institution for nice social finishings."

But his vision was not restricted to the intramural dimensions of Catholic scholarship. He had a deeply felt conviction that the intellectual element in a society is its most important component. Essentially a broker in ideas rather than an originator, he nevertheless became a symbol of the emerging Catholic intellectual of mid-century America.

Three of his papers on Catholics and the intellectual life are printed here. "The University in Time" was originally delivered in December, 1957 at the centenary dinner of Assumption University in Windsor, Ontario. "The Catholic Woman and the Intellectual Life," was addressed to the national Catholic women's honor sorority, Kappa Gamma Pi, at their convention in Buffalo in 1961. His remarks in "Accepting the Universe," originally a paper given at St. Mary's College in Winona, Minnesota in the summer of 1963, seem especially timely in this year of student unrest and revolt.

The University in Time

It is a formidable challenge which faces the speaker at a dinner held to celebrate a significant historical event. The occasion demands something weighty but the audience fervently hopes that the lecturer will be brief. The orator should communicate a profound message but his hearers want something light and entertaining. At a centenary celebration he should praise the institution which is commemorating its origin but the praise should not be greasy flattery.

I think that it is impossible to meet the demands of a moment like ours and consequently I shall not even attempt to do so. Certain facts must orientate my remarks and those facts are well known to all here present. Assumption University is now one hundred years old. Such a life-span would hardly be remarkable in Europe where there are many universities which have lived through seven centuries. Even on our continent, Mexico and Peru have universities which were born four hundred years ago. But in Anglo-Saxon America, a century is a venerable age for an institution of higher learning. The annals of Assumption will have many items of interest and edification. The trials and triumphs of the men who made this school what it is merit our applause and admiration.

Yet I do not wish to speak of any of these things. Certainly the men who direct the destinies of Assumption do not consider it to be one hundred years old but rather one hundred years new. Assumption University is in time; it is now. Inasmuch as it is, it has a task which is more dynamic than glorying in the giant-like exploits of its pioneering founders. What must Assumption do today? Let us address ourselves to that question.

Norms for testing

On Easter Day of this calendar year the Chicago *Tribune* published a study whose purpose was to rate the best universities in the United States. As all the critics of the report have admitted, the rating was by and large adequate. Yet, the listing of the schools is not so important for us here, though it is significant to say that not one Catholic institution of higher learning appears among the leading schools in the seven categories chosen.

Rather than discuss the ratings, it might be more to our purpose to discuss the norms accepted by the panel in its selection. They are five. In considering the goodness of a school, the judges examined first, the faculty. Was it made up of men and women with a genius for cultivating young minds? Secondly, what was the quality of scholarship produced by this faculty? To judge this factor, the research of the institution was scrutinized in the only evidence possible, publication. Thirdly, the student-body was examined. The raters looked for a student group marked by superior scholastic aptitude, intellectual curiosity and dedication to study. Only in the fourth place were the physical facilities of the college considered. The whole spirit of the examination was summed up in the final norm of selection. What is the ethos of the institution? Does it have the character of a community of scholars?

No one will deny that these norms belong to any valid testing of a university or college. But they need exegesis. The norms break up into three elements; faculty, students, and physical equipment. In this complex of view-points, the faculty is necessarily the first to be considered. According to the *Tribune* panel, two qualities were demanded from the faculty. It was to have the genius of stimulating growth in the young people who came to the school and it was also to engage in research which would be published.

On this topic we must delay a little. Catholic schools in Canada and the United States do not manifest a sufficient awareness of the function of the university faculty. They will admit that the professorate is the heart of any educational enterprise. Before we look for students, we must look for teachers. In some ideal order, we can easily imagine a university where the members of the faculty outnumber the students. There is little danger that this will occur in the hard world we live in, because economic pressures make it impossible. But we still set up optimum proportions for the numbers of the two corporations—perhaps one teacher to every four or five students. Certainly no one would conceive the desired ratio to be one teacher to every thirty students.

Yet the quantity of professors is not the main consideration in our examination of a faculty. The quality of the group is far more important. We Catholics have always rightly insisted that the teacher should teach. Cardinal Newman perhaps exaggerated this

notion, but his defect, if it was a defect, was only one of exaggeration. The university is the social locus where learning is communicated and so teaching will be its essential social obligation. However, it is the word teaching which cries for definition. The medieval university, from which all others descend, made much of the official text—Peter Lombard, Aristotle, Galen, and Gratian. In these summaries, the tradition of a particular learning was conserved. This was the first thing the student had to learn. Hence, the idea of the medieval university was to transmit the tradition. We Catholics still accept this view of the university's task.

The faculty

However, we must see how the medieval school accomplished its aims. The masters of the faculties did not communicate the contents of the text-book. This was the work of the bachelors, who were not members of the professorate but older students in pursuit of the master's degree. From the master or professor something quite different was expected. He would lecture on quodlibetals and on disputed questions. He would give the final training to the candidate for the license or degree, not so much by explaining a book to him, but rather by making him an apprentice in the professor's own work. The professor was engaged in advancing the area of knowledge. He was doing research and he made his findings public. The master took the tradition for granted and moved out from that starting point. Through his work of investigation the tradition grew, remained vital and dynamic.

If we wish to be true to our own tradition, our professors must not be mere text-book purveyors. Less of this need be done today than formerly because the student has the text-book in his hand, in contrast with the medieval scholar, who did not have it because printing had not yet made books easily available. Our professor to be what he should be must engage in research. The question of publication is really no question. *Bonum est diffusivum sui* is an old scholastic adage. If the professor has found something new, he will be thrilled and he will be restless until he tells others what he has found. He who searches will find. He who finds will be excited. He who is excited will talk. In reverse, he who does not talk, is not excited. He who is not excited never looked for some new phase of the wonders of reality. It is true that the good professor must

publish. This 'must' does not mean that it was a willed purpose of his life but rather an inevitable consequence of his proper functioning.

Here we have the true meaning of the university. It is the home of the scholar, both perfect and incipient. Without the perfect scholar, the university cannot exist, for the incipient scholars need the example of the perfect scholar to bring them to maturity. The university, as the *Tribune* norm states, is a community of scholars, but the elders of the community must be creative, productive, stimulating contemplatives. For Catholic institutions of learning, this must be stressed in season and out. Too often we are negative in our approach to our work. We wish to give a place to young Catholics where they will not be perverted in the acquisition of their vision of reality, and then forget that the negative or apologetic approach is not enough. A college does not exist only to prevent a young person from being infected by error; it exists positively to show him truth. Nor is truth something once-and-for-all done in the past. It must be achieved anew in every generation. Our Catholic schools, more than any others, must be zealous centers of search, zest and bubbling discussion. We are not a post-office, coldly delivering sealed letters from the past.

In consequence, our Catholic colleges need men of talent, trained in their disciplines, and intensely anxious to go ever deeper in their fields of research. Johns Hopkins University, when it began, was poor in its physical equipment. It was beginning a project which was not understood in the land. It had so much against it, but it had trained, enthusiastic searchers for truth as its faculty. Students were soon attracted from America and Canada, and the example of Hopkins transformed the education of our continent. The heads of our Catholic schools must bear this in mind, and even at the price of opposition and financial struggle, fill their schools with zealous searchers, and weed out ruthlessly the colorless, text-book commentators who are uninterested in or ignorant of their duties as searching scholars.

The student body

Although Cardinal Newman was not opposed to research institutes, he did not want the university to be considered merely as a research center. He insisted that the students belonged to the

university and they were there to be taught. I think that we all agree with Newman. However, as we have seen, the main preoccupation of the university must be its faculty. The next preoccupation will be the student-body.

Now the university is not a theater where anyone who can afford a ticket takes his seat. The student at the university is not a passive spectator but a junior participant in the enterprise of scholarship. Hence, we must screen the applicants for university admission. We are not interested in filling the chairs of the classroom but rather we are anxious that the right persons get a seat. The college is the home of search, and the young person unfitted for scholarship has no place there. Society has no contempt for a one-legged man, but he does not belong to a training school for football players. The football coach is not being snobbish or arbitrary if he excludes the one-legged man from the squad he is trying to form.

To be an incipient scholar three things are needed; a docility for methodic work, an insatiable curiosity about the real and its structure, and a will dedicated to incessant contemplation. Some degree of intelligence is demanded by these requisites but brilliance is not of the essence. Many great scholars were not brilliant men. Any young person endowed with the qualities mentioned has a right to go to college. His financial situation, his social status, his winsomeness of character or the lack of it are all irrelevant factors. Anyone who has the qualities is welcome, and one who lacks them can, at best, be only tolerated.

Professors who hear these words will mutter to themselves; how naive can you be? The classrooms are crowded with nit-wits, playboys, shirkers, and budding confidence men. I am not unacquainted with the facts of the situation. However, it must be said that this condition should not be so impressive that the diligent, studious, curious mind be completely invisible. Given the realities of the problem, our schools will not be exclusively frequented by scholar-apprentices. Yet, our administrators are in conscience bound to favor these and disfavor the others. The reflection guiding admissions and the keeping of those admitted must always be that the college is the social locus of scholarship, not a morally healthy environment, not a seminary of piety, not an institution for nice social finishing. Those who by tendency of will or slant of intellect

are not interested in the methodic satisfaction of curiosity, do not belong in college. They may indeed be tolerated, if there are not enough scholarly candidates for all the vacancies in the student body. But, even this toleration carries with it a proviso. The non-scholarly youths must not get in the way of the scholarly work of the teachers and the legitimate pupils. Nor should they be given any testimonial of scholarly accomplishment. To them can be given a certificate of presence in the college, and no more. The college should do everything to stimulate the curious mind. Its manifestation should be rewarded and the student's zeal honored. The social approbation of the school should not be for group leadership, virtue, social graces, or even church allegiance. The college is for scholarship, and should honor only those who do it, each according to his own degree.

We are anxious today because the Russians are producing more scientists than we. The anxiety will influence our choice of the type of student we admit and keep in our schools. If the result is that we shall make the college what it always should have been, and exorcise our institutions of the sickly non-scholarly principles whereby any youth whatever could go to and stay in college, the sputniks would indeed be a blessing rather than a threat. All college work is scientific, even the study of theology and arts. The Russian demand for scientific work and lots of it is not contrary to the aim of the university but a valid expression of it.

But, what of the fine young fellows who are not structured for scholarship? What will become of them? Rest assured that society will confect some kind of institution for their care and development. We prevent society from doing its duty as long as we educators take such subjects in detriment of the very aim of the university. Human beings are victims of inertia, and will do nothing until forced to do so. If the college traitorously (to itself) promises to take care of all young folk whatever be their mind, society will do nothing for the youngsters who do not belong in college. What is to become of these young men and women is not a burden on the conscience of the university, but of other institutions in society.

Physical plant

The last factor in university rating is the physical equipment the school controls. I shall treat this point cavalierly. There is an

obviousness about it, though it can at times be overstressed. The 13th century students of the University of Paris, to the scandal of their masters, petitioned for straw on the stone floors on which they sat to hear the lectures. The American educator, Mark Hopkins, is usually quoted—and erroneously—to the effect that an eager half-naked savage on one end of a log with a curious and informed man on the other is a university. This is an *outré* expression of something quite true, namely that the physical equipment of a school need not be plush and extravagant.

The physical side of the educational establishment should be in function of its aim, scholarship. It is the library we need; the gymnasium is not essential. Even the library must put its money, not in bricks and gargoyles, but in books and periodicals. The best exercise of the university student is his walk to and from the library. Laboratories we also need in our colleges, but only in proportion to the aims of the science courses offered. A cyclotron is hardly necessary for under-graduate physics. A roomy corner where the student seriously putters on his own projects under the guidance, stimulus, and applause of his professor is far more important than a costly automatic brain. If the college becomes more and more specialized and contemplates graduate work, then, with the blood, sweat and tears of the administrators, funds must be gotten by every means short of mortal sin.

It shames me to admit it, but I know very little about the history of Assumption University, although it has been an honor and a pleasure to be here in such a happy moment of its existence. Perhaps much that I have said need not have been said to the administrators, professors, and friends of the University because it has already been living up to all that I have suggested. If such be the case, it will be a satisfaction to the University that its own conception of a college is shared by others. If what I have said has not been wholly operative in the school, I humbly urge the University to think on my remarks and, if Assumption finds them true, to make every effort to have them live vibrantly in the present and future of this important institution.

The Catholic Woman and the Intellectual Life

A HUNDRED YEARS AGO this country was in the throes of a war which divided Americans into two hostile halves. There was no foreign foe involved during the four years of its duration, and yet the strife affected the whole world. 1961 offers us a world totally different from the one existing in 1861. The reason is quite obvious. Electricity, electronics, radiation, atomic energy, jet propulsion and cybernetics have so changed the rhythm of life that we are as far removed from the 19th century as it was from the 16th. Our earth-moving machines—real monsters!—do in a week what many men together needed months to accomplish in the past. It is not without reason that Fidel Castro played with the idea of exchanging his human prisoners for metal bulldozers.

When you see the juggernaut of a bulldozer ripping a landscape apart, you do not think of a book of logarithms. As the revolvers shoot on the television in your living room, it may arouse in you emotions and ideas quite alien to optics and electrical waves. However, these things were not about in the day of the Battle of Bull Run because science had not yet advanced so far. It is science which differentiates our age from those preceding us. The men and women who delve into the complexities of physics, mathematics and chemistry in their hidden studies are the ones who have produced the New World.

Science is one of the activities of the human spirit. In the sub-human world it has no counterpart. The beavers make their dams exactly in the same fashion followed by their predecessors ten thousand years ago. Their enterprise is cunning, admirable and efficient. But it could be bettered, and the principles involved in their work permit applications which could make the beavers' efforts more fruitful. But the beavers have no colleges, no scientific institutes and no laboratories. The result is that life for generation after generation of beavers is essentially the same. Human science advances with the ages and its applications continuously expand the range of human possibilities.

Our day is marked with characteristics other than physical progress. We are feeling the tension of a spiritual conflict between the communist powers and the democracies. Both the democratic ideas of men like Jefferson and Franklin and the communist idea of Marx and Engels are spiritual, and they are achieved in the effort of meditation. Yet the force of such conceptions materializes in the lives of men and women. The malaise of our world had its birth and energy in the mind of Karl Marx a century ago. The adage says that the pen is mightier than the sword, but mightier than either is the human mind without which there would be neither pen nor sword.

As a result of the work of the recent pioneers in psychology and psychiatry we know that man operates because of deep impulses which are never conscious and which defy reason. We also know that these impulses govern all we do. We do not love father, husband or child because of science and meditation. We do not even love them because of any reasoned conviction. We love them because of autonomous pushes which well up within us. It is difficult to persuade the young man or woman to avoid the marriage he or she is contemplating because of scientific arguments. If the love is there, your arguments will avail nothing. The misery foreseen by the elders will most probably come to pass but the young people are not concerned at the moment of their infatuation. Not all instincts are so despotic as the love of man for maid but all instincts work basically in the same way. It is quite easy to live one's life without much intellectual reflection. If we follow the pied piper of impulse and habit, we shall certainly live, but the story of such a life will hardly be a thing of beauty.

Meditation

All I have said wishes to point to a truth which is easily achieved. Meditation, be it philosophic, scientific or mathematical, is of the greatest importance for humanity. Without it there is no substantial difference between a man and a pig. The corollary of this truth is that man should hold mental activity higher than all others.

Such a conclusion will work itself out existentially in different ways for different people. For some it will mean that their work in life will be almost exclusively the disciplined contemplation of reality in any of its myriad phases. These will join the ranks of

the savants of our race. They will work in studies, libraries, laboratories and research centers. These are the men and women who are in search of more and more truth for its own sake. They do not care if others can turn their mathematical equations into nylon, atom bombs or cocktail shakers. They have dedicated their lives to know and to expand the field of human knowledge. These are the real intellectuals. They construct philosophies; they excogitate new theories for society and its fellowship; they measure the stars in the heavens; they make the statues and pictures men look at; they find rational principles in nature which other men can translate into machines and devices. There are never too many of them. Their life is necessarily ascetical. It must forgo many of the goods which appeal to human instincts. They will rarely be rich. They must get along without the many comforts and prizes which civilization can offer. But they are perfectly happy because what they do is soul-satisfying.

A peculiar structure of spirit is necessary to make a man or woman of this kind. You cannot make them by propaganda or regimentation. You can indeed turn a boy into an engineer but you cannot make him a physicist. You can make a bookkeeper but you cannot make a mathematician. You can make a catechist but you cannot make a theologian. In consequence of this truth, it would be lamentable if parents were to decide that Johnny must be an intellectual. If he has no bent for it because his mind is not open to truth for its own sake, or because he is strongly attracted to other goods of life, the effort to train him to be an intellectual will be a cruel torture. He will get no satisfaction out of the work for which he is not built, and he will be a drag on those who try to lead him onto the meditation. It is not wise to write him off as "too dumb." He will be clever enough for the solution of many problems in life but he is not interested in what he thinks are merely artificial problems which do not vex him as a living person. When it becomes clear that truth of an abstract nature does not stimulate him, he must not be forced to deal with it. Education and training will of course be necessary for him, but it should be given in the field where he is at home. If he obviously is clever at putting machines together but hopeless at grasping the notions of geometry, no one is helped when the poor fellow is forced through branches of the liberal arts.

They tell us that our colleges are overcrowded. This is not true. What is true is that our colleges have too many students who should not be there, with the result that those who do belong are not getting the attention which they deserve. The senseless cult of the college degree is undermining our whole system of values. Everyone should be trained in line with his innate capacities, but the college is not there for every kind of talent. There should be other institutions of training and the college should devote its energies to the formation of intellectuals exclusively. But why insist on this here, since the modern superstition is not going to vanish because of a sermon?

Let us consider the obligation of the man or woman who has a real talent for abstract meditation. By and large it is admitted that the male of the species can laudably go into the intellectual life, the life which can be easily defined as the dedication to the disciplined meditation of any facet of abstract truth. There are, however, doubts about the female of the species. To support the doubt an appeal is made to history. There has been no great woman philosopher, no great woman mathematician. I noticed that your society is under patronage of St. Catherine of Alexandria. Well, she is a completely mythical personage. History knows nothing of her, though it may be factually true that there was a woman martyr named Catherine; but all the rest is legend.

To answer this type of argument, feminists always point out that women in the past were excluded from intellectual training. In general this certainly cannot be denied, though there were rare exceptions. But it is true no longer. Feminists also properly animadvert to the fact that the sciences have been constructed by the male. No wonder, then, that man does better at it than women. It was cut to his size. If women had been more influential in the evolution of intellectualism, its rules would be as favorable to the female as to the male.

This ancient quarrel always seems to me ridiculous. Intelligence is neither male nor female. It is basically asexual, though sex may modify it accidentally. A priori there seems no reason why a woman cannot enter into intellectual activity or that a man has more capacity for it because of his sex. Madame Curie was not less scientific than her husband, and certainly more so than her father.

The contemporary Russians wisely open up their intellectual institutes to men and women without distinction. They are reaping the fruit of so much intellectual power inherent in women which was lost in ages past. It may possibly be true that the female intellectual will give up the chance of marriage, but so many great male intellectuals did the same. We need only mention Plato, Augustine, Aquinas, Kant, Newton and Santayana. Here perhaps the woman suffers somewhat. Society is more considerate of the bachelor than of the spinster.

However, the task facing those who hear me, is not the choice of a career for life. Almost all of you have chosen already, and most of you cannot change it now. But this does not mean that you do not have obligations toward the intellectual life. You have these obligations more acutely than other women because you are collegians. You have met intellectualism in your years of youthful training. You know it better than the average man on the street, even if you do not know it in all its depths.

The role of woman

Now whatever be the career you have followed, it is true for all that you have a role in your families and in society. What is more, you are called upon to act as Catholics. The Church which is a spiritual fellowship meets the world and influences it in terms of the laity. By a layman we mean a Catholic who is not separated from the world. The religious in a greater or lesser degree is segregated from the secular order but the layman is completely immersed in it. In the layman or laywoman the Church and the world establish contact. As I see it from the standpoint of theology, we shall never make the world a faithful copy of the Sermon on the Mount, but to the world we must give witness of the Gospel and the Good News must be preached to every creature and in every mode. The intellectual mode is certainly the most effective of all.

Two things, in consequence, must be done by you. The first is to inculcate a high esteem for the intellectual in your home environment. It may well be that no one in it is or will be a genuine savant. That is not a matter which we can determine. But the Catholic home should be a center where the primacy of the spiritual, not merely in a religious sense, is recognized by all. Books belong there and they must be cherished. The arts must adorn the habitation.

Study must be an occupation of all members according to their various stages of evolution. The family image of the intellectual must not be the egg-head but rather the most valuable man in society. An argument frequently used by Anglicans against clerical celibacy is the long list of English intellectuals who were brought up in the Anglican rectories of England. It is certainly true that such homes inculcated in all the children a profound respect for the true and the beautiful, but there is no reason why such an influence should be restricted to the homes of parsons. It is just as appropriate for the family of Catholic mothers who are college graduates.

There is a negative side to this obligation. The home I speak of will not make money-making or status-seeking the great good held before the eyes of the children. The intellectual does not make money nor has he a high status in society. The politician, the businessman, the practitioner of the arts and sciences do much better. The savant can hope for nothing more than to receive from society a sufficiency of material assistance for a decent life. He rarely gets even that.

Nor can the home we are discussing put the greatest value on comfort and instinctual satisfaction. The intellectual life needs asceticism. It requires orderliness in its work. The distinctive mark of scientific thought is discipline. If the home nurtures indiscipline or even tolerates it, it is not fostering the intellectual vocation. Spontaneous intuitions spring from any kind of soil, but an insight is not valid until it has been tested by scientific discipline. Science needs spontaneous insight, but an intuition is not necessarily scientific.

This patent obligation of married college graduates will meet with little opposition. But there is another obligation perhaps less visible. I speak mostly for Catholic school graduates. A college course keeps the student four years in a definite place, but the college student belongs to his school for the rest of his life. The college is a community and those who enter into it, enter forever. The colleges never let you forget it, and they address their appeals for money until you die—and not infrequently, even afterwards. But your contribution to the welfare of the school cannot be limited to monetary help, important as that is especially in our day. The

alumnus or alumna must exercise a prophetic function for the school. He or she must insist that high intellectual standards are introduced or maintained by *alma mater.*

That a college is socially desirable is neither good nor bad. Whether it shines in its athletic programs or other extracurricular activities is a matter of indifference. I would go so far as to say that if the students do not achieve that degree of piety we might desire of them, we still have no good reason to criticize the college severely. However, if the intellectual life of the school is meager or only mediocre, we should protest. Many a school prides itself that it forms the whole man. That phrase makes my hackles rise. There is nothing wrong with the idea, but the phrase so often means that the school considers the task of making a socially acceptable or solidly religious person as important as making a scholar. In fact, in some schools this is considered more important. The alumni of such schools must protest in the name of intellectualism. We have many non-scholastic institutions which foment social graces and piety, and we are glad that they are at hand. But this is not what we expect from a college worthy of the name. The prime goal of the true college is to implant scholarship. Anything else done on the campus is secondary, even though perhaps praiseworthy.

What the true college, the community's locus of scholarship, needs above all else is a competent corps of professors and a good library for undergraduate needs if the terminal degree given is only the bachelorate. On these two things the good college rests. Fine buildings, beautiful grounds and distinguished lectures are nothing to be despised, but a good college could exist without them.

The faculty

How are we to recognize a good faculty in a college? By the possession of genuine scholarship on the part of the majority of the teachers. Who is a scholar? The man or woman enthusiastically devoted to disciplined meditation on a phase of reality. Discipline is of the essence. The meditation must be exercised according to rules established by the scholarly brotherhood. The work should be personal and often original. It goes in for depth rather than breadth, though breadth of view will be a necessary condition. Research is the whole life of the scholar. If he teaches, we do expect that he will have some pedagogic ability. Yet it is more tolerable

that his pedagogy be bad than that his spirit of research be weak. The ideal would be a first-class researcher who is simultaneously an effective pedagogue, but rarely shall we find such a jewel. Nor must we think that the good pedagogue is the man or woman who can abbreviate and summarize clearly what real scholars have said. Such a man is only a popularizer. The true pedagogue stimulates his pupils to do research on their own. He makes them enthusiastic just as he is. He makes them independent thinkers rather than dependent on him. He communicates not only what others have said but what he has seen and experienced. He opens windows and doors; he does not close them. He brings the light; he does not shut it out.

The college professor to do his job must be himself trained in scholarship. The self-made scholar does exist but he is an exception. Scholarship is a communal endeavor. There is a tradition which flows through the generations and unless this tradition has been vitally met, the chances are that we only have an intelligent person who thinks that he has discovered the Tiber. The true scholar will speak to his own brotherhood, usually through published work. Publication does not prove that the professor is a scholar, for much published writing is hardly significant. But the lack of publication does arouse the suspicion that the teacher is not engaged in scholarly meditation, though this is not always so.

Most of you are alumnae of colleges where nuns do much of the teaching. This is something new in Catholic education and started in our country during the last century. Prior to that time, and even today beyond America, teaching by nuns was restricted to grammar schools or secondary finishing academies. In other words there is no long-standing tradition for college teaching by sisters. Hence they can only be adequately formed by going to universities and colleges run outside of the cloister. The alumnae should help them by demanding of their superiors that this be done. The alumnae should also demand that an unprepared religious not be assigned to teach a college course. Such demands will annoy Mother Superior but this annoyance will be the price we have to pay for a competent faculty in our sisters' colleges. If the sisters profess to run a college, nothing less than a scholarly college will square with this profession. It seems to me that the laity do not realize that

one of their duties in charity and loyalty is to stimulate clergy and religious to do their duties. If they are not stimulated, being human, they can easily fall into the morass of doing a sloppy job. Respect for clergy and religious does not mean the toleration of clerical sloth or incompetence.

The second thing which the good college needs is an adequate library according to the needs of the students. Here again the alumni and the alúmnae have the duty to help. If you have much money, and today so very few people do, build or endow your college library. At all events be interested in it and visit it when you return to the college campus.

A college library is more than a storehouse of books. It is an active instrument in college education and the pursuit of scholarship. A librarian is a scholar in his own right and of great importance to the school. Being a scholar, he or she needs university training. Library Science is of recent development but has gone a long way. The library is interested not only in books but above all in periodicals. A college must subscribe to many and bind them to preserve what it has acquired. The library not only collects books but it also eliminates them. The college library must not increase its holdings merely by keeping Sears, Roebuck catalogues and the volumes of *The Sacred Heart Messenger*. The library's physical plant must be conducive to work within it and without. It must be available as much as possible and not as little as possible. Its extent of materials must be wide and not narrow. The first concern of the librarian should be scholarship rather than the defense of the virtue of the students.

To run such a library is a costly chore. Yet our colleges are not rich; even the best endowed do not have much money for their work. Perhaps our alumnae should suggest to the college authorities that the campaign for a new statue for the chapel might be better inspired if the funds were directed to library needs. Again you will have to face the annoyance of Mother Superior but the annoyance in the long run will be fruitful. The college can get along without the statue, but it cannot get along without a good working library. Alumnae may think they are quite helpless when they have to face Mother Superior. However, they are not. Mother Superior indeed seems omnipotent and beyond the impact of earthlings. But this is

not so. She must adjust to those who can make contributions to keep her school alive. The adjustment may be painful for her, but it is never fatal. The customer may not always be right, but the store with no customers goes bankrupt.

This discourse is now over. It was not an essay in scholarship but rather some practical reflections about scholarship in relation to your obligations to it. It was exhortation rather than exposition. More could have been said nor are your obligations restricted to the points I have made. It is your work during this congress to explore the whole field and it is my hope that what I have said will be a stimulus to enter more deeply into the problems I have indicated and study many others which need attention. Let your whole discussion rest on one basic truth. The intellectual life is the most important element in any society. Where serious thinking according to scholarly discipline grows thin or disappears, the society is dying and will shortly be dead. If this fundamental insight governs your discussions, the results can only be profitable for you and all of us. Let your slogan be: *vivat scientia!*

* * *

The more I think about Fr. Weigel, the greater my sense of loss, which is truly that of the entire world of thought and spirit.

LOUIS FINKELSTEIN
Chancellor, Jewish
Theological Seminary

Accepting the Universe

The American university student resents the notion that he is not a concerned inhabitant of our world. In Latin-American universities, the student has no such resentment because his action in politics is recognized by the community as influential and strong. Yet even the Latin university man must recognize that his significant contribution to society will be in the future rather than now. He must have *some* patience.

Thomas Carlyle's remark on Lady Margaret Fuller's dictum that she accepted the universe was: Gad! She'd better. It is a good quip but hardly as profound as one might desire. It could be used in speaking at the commencement of a university, but it would be useful only if given a lengthy exegesis. At all events I shall use it as a peg on which to hang some reflections on the role of the university man in the world into which the graduate enters.

One acceptable meaning for the word universe is the sum total of everything with which a man can react. In this stipulated sense, the universe is vast, nor can it be traversed by mere experience. It is, of course, something more than a concept. It is out there. It acts on me and I act on it. I did not make it. I must accept it as a datum. From this point of view, everybody accepts the universe because they are helpless to get into any other. We are here for better or worse until death do us part.

The universe so considered requires a resignation from even the most romantic rebel. The potential in it is indeterminate, but there is a limit even if we do not know precisely where it is. The limiting condition of our milieu must be accepted and only in its generous acceptance can our action be wise. You cannot make a lobster stew if you have no lobsters. You can, indeed, make something like it, or even better than such a stew. But it is only an ersatz product. It is not genuine and cannot be.

This truth is banal, but most banal truths have the advantage that they are true and they have the disadvantage that very few men bother to assimilate the truth in depth. Such analysis will bring forth distinctions but the medieval scholar insisted that *qui bene distinguit, bene docet*—he who distinguishes well, is a good

teacher. You will excuse me for dropping a Latinism into my discourse, but the Commencement Address is about the only occasion which still lends itself to such antiquarian pedantry.

For some people acceptance of the universe means the perfect adjustment of the self to the situation at hand. This will include any *de facto* social situation or the current form of economic arrangement. They will urge young people to let well enough alone. They think that it shows a good heart if you see that today's configuration of things is unjust and harsh for many of our fellow men, but the laws of the Medes and the Persians cannot be changed. Therefore, use them to your advantage and climb socially until you become the squire of the village. In this way you will become a success, which means that you have acquired some amount of social power and you will be able to keep it, provided the framework is not changed.

A young man or woman finds this dreary counsel. As the result of your disciplined study in a university center, you should have seen the serious defects of our human frameworks. If your only goal in college was to see how you could use our existing styles of living together and of making things for your personal comfort in the future and for the manipulation of social power for private ends, your university weeps. The function of the college is to make a liberal man, but the climber and exploiter are just selfish and narrow.

The stand-patter who believes that he has recognized the truth of accepting the universe, does not understand the world at all. This universe which is given to us is not static. It is dynamic with a nisus toward evolution. You do not accept it if you do not move with it and do not help it to move.

Cosmic ascent

The universe can be imagined as having once begun as a sticky sputtering, plastic mass in the limiting vacuum of nothingness. But it was never purely inert. The finger of God put motion into it and it revolves about its own axis with its own power. It rushes with dazzling speed, engendering a vortex which rises within it, and thins out the slithery stuff of the primal cosmos. It never stops, and the stuff whirling about the silent, serene center moves upwards vertically to a distant unreachable point which Teilhard de Chardin

calls Omega, known to Jews and Christians as Yahweh-God. The faster it turns, the thinner it gets and the higher it reaches, yearning to approach ever nearer to the pure energy which gives it life and direction. It will never encompass the point which is its goal, for that remains outside of it as an exterior limit, just as the surrounding nothingness walls it in upon itself. But its movement ever upwards makes it ever more transparent, allowing a better glimpse of the Light which is its guiding and attraction principle. But the movement upward is not constant. The moving particles when gifted with humanity are not so much moved as moving in terms of personal decision. They can be sluggish and move only in a circle rather than in a spiral. They can even fall back to an earlier point in the rise of the total universe. The rise therefore, is not a uniform rhythm; it includes contraction and dilatation, even though in a long-view gaze the tower is truly climbing upwards. The journey to the heights blends freedom and necessity, and neither factor is ever cancelled out.

If we may draw images to explain the universe, the one I have delineated will not be altogether inadequate for our purpose. It shows us that accepting the universe is not a lethargic resignation to the level where the human agent finds himself. He must thrust himself up the sides of the column to raise its altitude by himself whirling on the shoulders of the particles which stand the highest, and support in turn the ascension of a particle yet to arrive.

The world into which our graduates are entering is a high point in our cosmic ascent. In our lifetime we are held back less and less by the stubborn inertia of matter. We labor less and produce more than our immediate ancestors did. We have freed ourselves from the restriction of finding our energy mainly in animal muscle. We use steam, petroleum, electricity, and electronics, and we have finally made the energy of the atom a source of power which man can tap almost at will. Our doctors know more about the workings of our material bodies with the result that it is easier to conserve them with fitting food and repair them when individual parts lose their power to cooperate with the whole. It is a long cry from the day when man's crude instruments of creativity were dedicated exclusively to the task of sheer survival.

Yet we must not overlook our shortcomings while singing a

dithyramb over our assets. More than half of the population on this little earth is enslaved to the necessity of a none-too-successful struggle to stay alive. For them the human capacity for high vision has no opportunity to be actualized. They must concentrate not on the dynamic nisus in the universe but rather on its hostile inertia, which must be laboriously overcome.

Man, the high point of our little planet's history, must live with other men. He cannot stand alone. In consequence, man has organized societies for regulating our living together. Such arrangements are flexible and they are constantly changing. Yet in this moment social malaise is a universal experience. Within any particular society, we are shocked by too much crime; too many of our citizens are too ready to grab from the community, while oblivious of the need to make contributions; the value of human contracts is sinking because their fulfillments become shoddier and shoddier through man's nonchalant irresponsibility. In the total human family, component commonwealths threaten each others' existence with humanly inflicted horrors, and there is the danger that in this mutual hostility the human genus will destroy itself. Our graduates can see that this universe is not only a nisus up but also a miserable inertia dragging it down. Life is a tension between these two forces, and absolute repose is another name for death.

In the light of these reflections I can speak of the mission of our graduates. They can do much for us and for our universe. Potential is here and because of the knowledge which college has given them, they can release this potential creatively. To create and to surpass is their calling and only in accepting it generously can they live a satisfying life. Fame may not come to them, nor gold, nor comfort, nor a dazzling career. All these things are fortuitous and not necessary. To be true to a well-understood universe they must create, and therein lies their total mission. Nor does this mean a conquest of the world. If they pull themselves to a level above that already reached by our fellowmen, they have pulled all of reality with them. It may be only an inch, but that puts the whole world one inch higher in its climb to Omega.

In such a mission, no definite place in the circle of being is required. Cosmic movement is not only around but also up, and you can move that way from any point on the wheel of life. But it

needs eonstant effort and rest is lawful only to refurbish the slaeking energy in us. Nor should the life of eontinuous effort frighten man. In every minute of our human existenee we are active and in any action we are striving for the satisfaetion of some urge pushing us on. The one satisfaetion whieh knows no bitter aftertaste is the realization that something positive has entered into the world through my planning and through my deliberate action. Not only is it an abiding satisfaetion but also a stimulus to overcome the limitations whieh my own work shows. Creativity is man's best drive and stagnation his only frustration.

Inertia in opposition

Nor must we forget the inertial principle in every dimension of the universe. If you plan to better the social order, do not strive to make it perfeet. Universal inertia resists perfeetion. Whenever the reformer proceeds toward this goal, we have a tyrant. He offers us liberation from some felt evil, only to plunge us into a new slavery. Creaturely freedom is always open to abuse, and if you make abuse impossible, you have destroyed earthly freedom. Some abuses we can live with, though there are others whieh get into the way of freedom itself. The latter should be fought but the former must be tolerated.

Yet the inertia of the world is no reason for refusing to ehallenge it. It gives way to attaek but it is like an onion. You ean strip off layer after layer but you never eome to the eore of the thing. This truth ean be put simply: man may in eountless ways become better but no matter how much better he gets, he will always be a man and never God, even though he ean be god-like. Man's restless enterprise, then, to be sueeessful, must be fused with humility. This is the serene aceeptation of the universe. Humility is never lassitude but mueh rather the effeetive reeognition of worldly limitation without being erushed by it. The man who claims that he is transforming man into divinity, has no understanding either of God or man, and he will suffer the inevitable eonsequenee by beeoming less than man.

The phrase, war of the generations, has its truth, yet men of my age arrive slowly to the humbling realization that their peer group has not molded the world nearer to the heart's desire as they had set out to do. But not all emerge from this experience as cynics.

Many, therefore, look at the rising generation with hope renewed. Once more an adult human being in association with millions of his kind, puts on his space suit to go out where man has never been. The older generation quite genuinely hopes and prays for him. Any such younger man, whether he literally or only metaphorically scouts the unknown which lies about us, is entering on a racking but glorious adventure. We admire him and we are proud of him. It is the one who refuses to accept the challenge who must be pitied and despised. He is pitied because he does not know how thrilling life in this universe can be. He is despised because in spite of the many little reasons he uses in self-justification, he remains as little as those reasons themselves. Talents are to be traded with; there is no reward for burying them in the ground.

CHURCH AND STATE

When one thinks of Church and State in America, one naturally thinks of another Woodstock professor who was Gus Weigel's close friend, Fr. John Courtney Murray. Although his friend dominated the field, Gus also made his contributions to the Church-State theory which grew out of the American experience. The eleven years he spent in a predominantly Catholic country with vestiges of officially established Catholicism had given him a unique view of the problem; he could add this to the basic Murrayan theory which he adopted.

As his ecumenical interests increased, his thinking on Church and State was further refined. Significantly, the subcommission of the Secretariate for Promoting Christian Unity on which he served was that concerned with the question of tolerance.

The two selections given here are undated, but both are most likely from his last years.

Pluralism and Theology

One of the difficulties in all communication is the impreciseness of the terms we employ. On this obvious fact Logical Positivism has built an impressive structure. Concerning the adequacy of that philosophy there can be discussion, but no one will deny that the theory has recognized some basic facts. In the light of that philosophy we can say that words as used in every-day discourse do not coincide with points of thought but only hover flutteringly over fuzzily delimited areas of meaning and emotion. For the Logical Positivist it is the function of a mental discipline to restrict its terms to pin-point meanings and thus necessarily create a jargon which accurately serves the discipline as its language.

Leaving Logical Positivism to one side, it is still true that in a philosophic debate we must do something more with the word, pluralism, than merely use it. Within the limits of possible definition, we must define it. This duty throws us at once into the wild country of semantics. As a philosophic word, pluralism, according to the Oxford Dictionary, was born in 1887 as an antonym to monism. This makes the birth slightly illegitimate, for to oppose monism, the word should be polyism, but it has in its favor the dubious justification of an analogy with dualism. However, the earlier philosophic content of the word has been modified and today the word is not a protest against materialism or idealism but rather a connotation of multiplicity of world-visions and basic interests within one community. I take it that this is the sense that we attach to the word in our discussions.

World visions must necessarily include reference to the ultimate ground of being, and as Paul Tillich has brilliantly taught, the ultimate ground of being is the true name of God. Hence a world vision cannot escape the religious question. In fact the teaching of so many thinkers who declare that the core of all culture is religion at least confirms the religious character of culture and world-vision. Consequently a pluralistic society is one where there will be no unity of religious theory or practise among the members of the given community, but rather an indefinite number of religious schemes, including a null class which will reject religion altogether.

Though man is anxiously fond of his liberty, he rarely is as anxious about the liberty of his fellows. Moreover, the intellect is a drive to a monistic vision of reality and conviction of one's own *Weltanschauung* usually brings with it an urge to impose it on others in the name of truth. This condition, present in all thinkers, is especially manifest in theology. The theologian by postulate deals with God's plan for the world, and by concept men are not free to accept God's plan or reject it. When the theologian has discovered such a scheme, or thinks that he has discovered it, he or his disciples are very prone to insist that all men, under coercion if necessary, follow the scheme excogitated. They fight in the name of God, the greatest name, and their war is a holy war, the fiercest of all wars. Theology, unlike other mental disciplines, is not neutral but is of its nature committed so that involvement is inescapable.

Church and state

Where theological monism is most felt today is in the realm of Church-State relationships. It would be a mistake to think that only Catholic theologians deal with this theme. Every kind of theologian is interested in the question, and, as has been said, theological interest is never calm. It is heated and anxious. Paul Blanshard would be very surprised if he were told that his works are essentially theological works. But they are. His theory of God is the basis of his solution of Church-State problems. He has no quarrel with religion as such and therefore he is not a blatant atheist. His concept of religion and therefore of God is implicit in his work, but he does not develop it anywhere. He thinks that God is somehow constructed by men and the community. He demands that this construction be made according to the democratic process of free debate followed by a show of hands indicating a majority opinion which then becomes normative for all. If any individual does not accept this God and this theology, by the very theory of democracy, he is free to have another theory; but he must not try to dictate social behavior in the light of that theory, though he is free to expound his doctrine in the hope of gaining popular support. Amazing though it be, this is a monistic approach to the religious question of the community. Blanshard reduces the pluralism of theology to a monism by reducing the manifold to the unity of the least common denominator of universal consent. This reli-

gious vision is then made obligatory for all.

Paul Blanshard was needlessly surprised that other theologians, including non-Catholic theologians whom he presumed would be with him, opposed his theology. In general, theology by its inner logic rejects the notion of a constructed God. God has always meant the absolute Lord who is and tolerates no construction. His will is law for all men, and as creatures they are not free to put God's will before the tribunal of human criticism. If God commands, no matter what the community may say or think, the religious man must accept that command, even though the acceptance means death. Man is physically free to reject God's will and in so doing he sins, but he is not morally free to put limits to that will, any more than it is in his competence to repeal the law of gravity, on the grounds that it is inconvenient or contrary to the democratic principle.

However, in a group like ours we are not interested in Blanshard's theology which is not very relevant to our commitments. We are interested in Catholic theology. Its stand on Church-State relationships affects our lives in the community and affects our vision toward the concrete community of which we are members.

Instead of declaring what that theology is in terms of legitimate theological method, it might be wise to see the history of Christian theology in the Church-State question. In the first days of Christianity, the Christian community was made up in large part by Jews, slaves and non-Roman converts. The Christian message was pointed by a hope in the quick return of Christ to inaugurate a new situation on a new earth under new heavens. The non-Roman members of the Roman Empire had no great loyalty to a governing system which was imposed on them by military force, and the Jews hated it. Christian contact with the government brought about conflict which was menacing to the Christian. He felt himself separated from his community both by his own doctrine as well as by the juridical fact that the government was intent on destroying him. The Christians were a *tertium genus* and as such their interest in the Roman Empire was not in terms of love and devotion. They did take seriously the words of Christ whereby we must render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's and they prayed for Caesar and the magistrates. Nevertheless they had no belief in the durability of the Roman Empire, which they hoped would soon be destroyed.

The eschatalogical preoccupations of the first Christians prevented them from reflecting on their role in the building up of society. They took it for granted that the returned Christ would take care of that. To their contemporaneous society they owed nothing but obedience to the laws in as far as those laws were compatible with the laws of Christ. The Christians never contemplated as possible or desirable a union of the Church with the existing State. In the new order there would not only be identification of Church and State, but rather there would be an elimination of the State altogether.

End of eschatology

This condition did not extend beyond three generations. In the second century the Apologetes appear and they are striving for peace with the Roman Empire, and some of the Apologetes loved the Roman Empire. The Jewish animus against Rome was no longer felt in the Church because new Jews were not entering the Church, and the older Christian Jews were dead or dying. The eschatalogical hope gave way to a somber realization that the prompt return of Christ was not part of the Christian message but only a desire rather than a dogma. We note therefore the perpetual cry of the Christian apologetes: we too are Romans, and why therefore should we be treated as if we were a foreign enemy? We obey the emperor, we pay our taxes, we join the army and do all that you do except worship in the official temples.

It is quite clear that these apologetes realized that the Roman government had a tradition in religion which was unacceptable to the Christians, but they did not demand that that tradition be abolished. They only asked that they might live in the community without accepting it. These Christians were the first to cry for freedom of religion in society and they were the first to deny that the State had any spiritual competence. We know that the Roman government was not willing to accept this revolutionary thesis and therefore kept up its war on these rebels, who were rebels only to the degree that they would not accept the State's decrees of religion. Let us recall one important aspect of this legislation; it was strictly theological, for it derived from the nature of religion itself as conveyed by the religious vision the governers shared.

By the fourth century the Christian minority became great

enough to be considered a respectable force. In the politics of the days of Constantine, it was a good move to win over this great minority. This Constantine did and as a lure he made Christianity a legitimate form of Roman religion. He went farther; he made it the preferred religion. At last the Christians were not merely a *tertium genus* but the best Romans. It is interesting to see how soberly they accepted their victory. The pagan temples were still open; the cult of the gods was still allowed. Many of the best people still kept the ancient faith, and on the countryside, the heathdwellers were overwhelmingly pagan, (as the word itself shows, for heathen is a literal rendition of the *pagani*—the farm folk). The laws were still structured in terms of Graeco-Roman religious ideas.

St. Augustine's *De civitate Dei* is an eloquent testimony to the condition that he found. In that book he tells us how he witnessed the Cybele cult when he was younger. The pagan plays with their obscenities were still to be seen. The pagans blamed the fall of Rome under the sword of Alaric on the Christians who had forced the exile of the savior gods of Rome, and their voice was loud and strong enough to make Augustine pay heed to it for the peace of the Roman Christians. The ancient religious structure of the Empire was tacitly accepted by the Christians as somehow proper to Rome, their Rome, to which they were loyal but with an uncomfortable loyalty.

While Augustine was finishing his great work, Western Rome was sliding down into chaos as Salvian the Marsillian priest clearly showed. The great Rome was not capable of keeping its position by the force of arms and the Germans were eating at its marrow like a cancer. The shell remained but the inner life was gone. The German could not give it a new inner life, and so the Church took over, because she was the only vital power in the West. The Roman community disappeared, but there still was a community because the same group which was formerly Roman, was still Christian. The German destroyed its Romanness but he could not destroy its Christianity, and the community stood erect. In the minds of many, this perdurance was Roman, and so Sidonius Appolinaris, Bishop of Clermont, could say that as long as the Church survived, Rome survived, and in a sense this was true.

The community of the Church was now the community of

Western Europe. Little by little the non-Catholic Germans accepted Catholicism and thus entered into the community of which before they had been outside rulers by usurpation but never members in reality. Once converted, their ruling function took on a new meaning; they now had it by concession of the Church which was the community. The only theory which explained the situation was the Two Sword doctrine of Boniface VIII (1302), according to which the Church had double power, one spiritual and the other temporal. The Bishops kept the spiritual power and gave the temporal power to the princes, but *ad nutum et patientiam sacerdotis*. It is interesting to compare the doctrine of Peter Damian (d. 1072), one of the first proponents of the Two Sword theory, with the later formulation of Boniface. Damian does not subordinate the secular sword to the spiritual but rather coordinates the two, but even in Damian, the doctrine of the Paris Synod of 829 is implicit, namely that both powers are powers of the Church, and the Paris Synod explicitly derives its doctrine from the Gelasian formula of 494 which did not state that the two powers were in the Church, but explicitly says that there were two powers in the world.

The movement from Gelasius to Boniface is caused by the situation of Western Europe. This part of the globe was a tiny part of the world, insignificant in comparison with great communities elsewhere and less than insignificant when compared with the total ecumene. Yet the Church was in its own consciousness identified with this splinter of the earth because the knowledge of geography was so slight. Gelasius was still of the tradition that was born in pluralism, but that pluralism melted into the cultural monism of Western Europe. With this fusion the Gelasian theory underwent a change. Gelasius says that in the world there are two powers: emperor and episcopate. Boniface substitutes for the word "world," the word "Church." The substitution was easy and almost unavoidable. The only ecumene that the Western Europeans knew was the Church of the West under the Bishop of Rome. They knew that Moslem existed, but Moslem was the barbarian outer world of no great importance, except as a threat. They knew that the Orthodox Church existed, but this was a schismatic church out on the edge of things. Western Europe was not confronted with pluralism as a fact and it theorized in terms of a monism which was the prevailing situation.

One of the jests of history is that, at the moment that Boniface VIII formulated the theory that explained the Europe of five centuries, Europe was no longer what he described. Philip the Fair was intent on withdrawing from the dominant monism of his world in order to form a pluralism, the pluralism of national communities in secession from the ecumenical society. From that point on pluralism was on the march. In the beginning, the national unities still kept the culture of the ecumene, but when the Reformation broke out, that culture ceased to be one and the same. Religion, root of culture, became plural rather than unique. The Catholic theorizers of that moment did not fully understand what was going on, and they still used the old formulas of Christendom as valid for the moment, because they did not believe that the momentary cultural chaos would perdure. But it did. Bellarmine and Suárez did modify the old Bonifacian formula, but they kept the substance of it. They put kings indirectly under the Pope, but it was done on the hypothesis of Boniface and not on the hypothesis of Gelasius, namely that secular power somehow belonged to the Church and the Church was Western Europe and the World.

From the 14th to the 19th century pluralism moved from one level to another. 14th century nationalism did not change the basic outlook for Western Europe, though it did change its politics. The 16th century did much more, for it broke Europe religiously into two parts with a wide no man's land between them. The 18th century took the supernatural out of the dominant vision of the time and the 19th century spewed a whole flock of philosophies, almost all of which were naturalistic and secularistic. The position of the Church in these times of trouble was uneasy. Up to the 19th century the old formulas were still capable of concrete application, though the area of application was every day smaller. By the end of the first third of the 19th century, the formulas simply could not be applied anywhere. The monistic hypothesis of the formulas had disappeared and a pluralistic hypothesis could hardly support a Two Sword theory. Europe in no true sense could be identified with the Church and the Church of the Diaspora was becoming more numerous than the Church of the Catholic lands.

Pius IX and Leo XIII

Yet the need of a formula was desperate because Catholicism was being ousted from every privileged position and cast into chains. As in the past, the Popes themselves essayed the task of framing a valid formula. Pius IX worked at it and Leo XIII produced a consistent doctrine which still must guide the theological thinking of the teachers of Catholic dogma. The Two Sword theory was quietly dropped, and no one wept for it. There was a return to Gelasius who taught that there were two powers in the world, rather than two powers in the Church. Leo insisted that these two powers, each sovereign, must work in harmony and concord, for otherwise there would be chaos. He also insisted on the primacy of the spiritual. The dubious formula "union of Church and State" was given a precise content in terms of theory. There can be no concord unless the two powers collaborated, and such collaboration is of itself a union. Much of Leo's writing was polemical, but his polemic was theological. He rejected the naturalistic theology of the Liberals and refused to build his formula on it. Instead he used the perennial theology of Christianity and derived from it his formula.

There is ambiguity in the Leonine teaching. Much of it, especially in his communications to the so-called Catholic lands, supposed religiously monistic communities, by hypothesis Catholic. The ambiguous term here is "Catholic." It was certainly true that by counting the heads of those who declared that their religion was the Catholic religion, all of these countries were in their overwhelming majority Catholic. However, there was not a single country, Spain not excluded, where the Catholic vision of time and eternity was the prevailing vision of the community. There were in all of these lands Catholic minorities trying mightily to make the Catholic vision prevail, but in no country were they successful. The Catholic lands *de facto* were only ambiguously Catholic.

A second ambiguity in Leo's doctrine is his concept of "the people." In French, Spanish and Italian this word can have a pejorative meaning in the sense of the irresponsible, ignorant and lawless mob. Some of Leo's uses of the word "people" lead one to think that he was using the word in this invidious sense. Government of the people in such a context means arbitrary and unprincipled mob rule. "The people" as it appears in the Constitution

of the United States of America is quite a different word. It is like the old *Senatus Populusque Romanus*, a dignified and lofty term. Leo's concept of popular government all too often is indicative of unworthy government, and his attitude to the people is that of suspicion rather than trust. In his writings one feels that the government should take care of "the people" rather than be guided by the people. The government is patronal and the people are minors under the guidance of mature governors. This does not mean that Leo was anti-democratic in theory. His letter to the United States, *Longinqua Oceani*, shows high regard for our democracy. However, his writings as a whole show a lack of faith in the maturity of Latin European peoples for an effective and orderly democracy. The will of the people is not for Leo a norm the governor should follow; he should rather be guided by an objective order of social obligations, no matter what an immature people might want.

A third ambiguity in Leo is the concept of "union of Church and State." His arguments in its favor are certain sociological considerations; *idem civis et Christianus*; benefits to the State because of concord; confusion without collaboration. Now the union required for collaboration is not necessarily juridical in the light of such argumentation. Hence if we only consider the premises of the Leonine doctrine, constitutional establishment is not a necessary conclusion to his thought. And yet other affirmations seem to demand not only constitutional establishment of the Church but also suppression of all other religions according to the possibilities of peaceful government.

These ambiguities can be resolved if we note that the usual hypothesis of Leo is a monistic culture. Given a monistically Catholic community all that he says concerning establishment is logical; in fact, a truism. If a given community is overwhelmingly Catholic not only in name but in fact, whether it be democratic, oligarchic or monarchic, the position of the Church will be supreme *de facto* because of the active faith of the people. That supremacy may be expressed in a constitution as a recognition of a fact, or it will dominate the life of the community as an unwritten law. By the sheer consistency of facts, ontal establishment will be unavoidable. Non-Catholic members of such a community would not be persecuted, but their world-vision would be spontaneously judged alien

and irrelevant to community concern. Their world-vision would not be considered at all because it would have no bearing on the life of the community as such. The minority could plead for tolerance. It could plead for no more, because of the very framework of the society in which the minority chooses to live.

An ideal?

Now the further question is this: does the Catholic doctrine consider this as the ideal toward which all society must strive, and therefore is it in the abstract the highest and truest law for all societies? Some theologians believe that Leo taught this. However, it is not clear that he did. Political societies of their nature do not demand a perfect monism of culture. All societies show some degree of pluralism, even though the general climate may not be pluralistic in substance. Now political society is always and everywhere necessary by the natural law according to Leo and all Catholic thinkers, even where the culture is pluralistic. In such a society the Leonine hypothesis is not verified, and all the conclusions of the hypothesis are irrelevant. To say that any and every society has an innate tendency to a monistically religious culture, simply is an unproven assertion. Political form takes over in a given culture. It does not make that culture, and is incapable of unmaking it. Moreover, in the Catholic conception of things, membership into the Church depends on grace freely given by God and on the free assent of men. To say that civil society by logic tends to the Catholic religion is to say that a natural thing tends by inner dynamism to the supernatural, and that makes the supernatural really natural. Therefore social organization in the abstract is not committed to religious monism. It will be monistic or pluralistic according to the culture of the people who constitute the community. Where it is pluralistic, the monistic type of society is not at all ideal, even though it may by some be ardently wished for. In fact, a society by structure pluralistic would be going against its own proper ideal if it strove to impose monism, since this would shatter actual community unity rather than tighten it.

Therefore in the light of a philosophic analysis of Leo's doctrine, there is no one ideal governmental relationship to the Church. There are many ideal relationships according to the many forms culture may take in given societies. Where culture is monistically Catholic,

factual establishment will take place spontaneously. The government need not concern itself about it at all. If it has taken place by the sheer weight of Catholicism in the community, the government will operate accordingly without legal reflections or constitutional concern, for the government like every other reality in the community lies under the pressure of the culture which is the air by which the community lives. Where culture is pluralistic, establishment will be out of the question, for the purpose of a political society is to unify the human multitude for its own temporal prosperity and peace, which latter concept includes freedom as its goal. There can be no unification and no freedom if one of the many world-visions of the commonwealth is the dominant dynamism of public order and public policy. The imposition of one vision would mean that large sections of the people simply could not collaborate with the policies and demands of the government, and the result would be either the dissolution of the society or perpetual coercion which, since it curtails liberty, renders peace impossible. In such a situation it is not proper to say that the government should tolerate the pluralism of its society. Toleration is here a word without applicability. Minorities out of step with a vast majority can be tolerated but a whole society is not tolerated. Non-establishment of a religious vision is ideal for such a community and not a matter of momentary sufferance, but non-establishment does not by concept imply lack of concord and collaboration.

The fact of pluralism

The heated debate in contemporary Catholic theology concerning Church-State relationships arises from the inability of certain theologians to recognize the pluralism of modern society. Now the prevalence of pluralism simply must be admitted. An individual may deplore it, but in so doing he merely manifests his deep allegiance to his own vision of what reality at its best could be; he is not making a logical criticism of what reality actually is. The ambiguously called Catholic lands are no less pluralistic than the others, and this holds for Spain as much as for the others. A frank recognition of this fact would eliminate the phenomenon of the conflicts between juridical monism and actual pluralism. The theologians of the monistic tradition draw all kinds of false conclusions from dogmatic formulas whose hypothesis was monism. When

that hypothesis is not verified, the conclusions from the formulas are not applicable. Monism is not and never was a part of the Catholic thesis. It, like pluralism, is only a logical hypothesis, normative of a mode for the application of the true thesis under certain circumstances. The thesis itself absolutely asserts the autonomy of the Church as a spiritual society compenetrating a secular society directed by an autonomous State. Two corollaries of this basic thesis are: first, the position of the Church is of a higher order than that of the State, because the spiritual is always primatial; second, the two autonomous societies must work in harmony and concord according to the modalities of each. This much is thesis. All the rest is hypothesis.

The Responsibility of Religion for the Social Order

On other occasions I have had the privilege to speak on our theme. Here, therefore, I shall put briefly what has been said at length elsewhere. I shall speak from the Christian viewpoint, though not all Christians will agree with me.

The title which was given me to elaborate is not clear. If the social order under discussion is the social order within one particular church, obviously the church is wholly and exclusively responsible for its social order. This needs no discussion except in the confines of that church alone.

I suppose that the social order under consideration is the secular order in which all men live, no matter what church they belong to, if any. In this hypothesis, the social order is a basic element of secular society. The Christian view, as I see it, teaches that secular society is a distinct reality from the Church which is a sacral society. What happens in the secular society cannot be the responsibility of the Church unless by mutual contract this phase of secular life has been committed to the Church by the secular society itself. When this happens, the Church has undertaken a secular obligation which is to be fulfilled with the instrumentalities

granted by civil secular society. If the job is not being done properly, the civil community has every reason to complain against the Church of a breach of contract.

However, I do not think that this hypothesis is real anywhere in the world in which we now are. I know of no civil society today which has given the supervision of the social order to any church. Hence I say flatly that today the Church has no direct responsibility for the civil social order anywhere because this concern lies outside of the area of the Church's direct action.

With this said, I must also affirm that the Church has a preoccupation with the social order of the secular world. It cannot be indifferent to it. However, the Church cannot be blamed for secular social structure nor has it the obligation to plan, control or revise it. The secular social order belongs to the secular dimension of man and therefore it looks to a dynamism other than the Church for its being and efficiency.

Sacral and secular authority live in the one and same world. One and the same man is both sacral and secular, simultaneously under the directives of Church and secular society. The Church is not the *saeculum* but it lives, works and thinks *in saeculo*. It is of eternity but in that sector of eternity which is fused with time. No matter what the secular power does or does not do, the Church must teach its own concept of social fellowship and must demand that in its own closed community such a vision be respected and, as far as human fragility permits, be actualized. This will be conditioned by the secular component of human life.

All religions, which in this address I call the Church, teach ascetical self-control at least to the degree of effective submission to just law, even when that law is purely secular. All religions believe in the virtues of justice, sobriety and honesty. All religions somehow have a vision of the universal fellowship of man. These virtues contribute immensely to a beneficent social order. Where these virtues thrive, the secular social order is healthy and dynamic. Police power cannot produce these virtues, but the Church can inculcate them better than any other agency.

The fatal enemy of any social order is individual and collective selfishness. The Church because it teaches man that he is not the Lord but under the Lord, necessarily strives to inculcate unselfish-

ness. Unselfishness can exist in men who are not orientated to God, but such men are few. For the generality, religion alone engenders an atmosphere of unselfishness. The energy of the Church is of great importance, therefore, to the well-being of the secular social order. Secular powers, therefore, for their own ends should foster the work of the Church which itself is not for their end.

Hence, this means that the Church promotes virtue without primarily intending the good of secular society. It does so only because it is the will of God, the Lord both of the Church and of secular society. Even if secular society were totally uninterested, the Church would still have the mission of preaching virtue. The Church in just being the Church helps secular society by way of by-product. That society has no right to ask the Church to do more. Church meddling in the secular order has brought grief both to the churches and to secular societies. We must not secularize the Church either in the name of the Church or in the name of the secular community. Under no circumstances can an unbelieving secular society use for its secular purposes the Church which by constitution and dedication is above the secular society's concerns.

What is more, the Church in her prophetic role as the spokesman of God must prophesy to the secular community. It must stoutly condemn its injustices and preach to it the true concept of man as seen in divine revelation. Such prophecy will rarely be accepted and usually the prophet will receive the prophet's recompense, persecution and stoning.

Unless we keep these basic principles quite clear in mind, we may soon get off the road in our present discussions which deal with a highly serious matter. We must not enlist the Church in a campaign to save the secular society or enhance its power. This the Church cannot do. As men interested in the secular good of our secular society, we must see that all we can do is urge the Church to be genuinely herself. When she is that, by way of by-product good will adhere to the secular society in which the Church is a lodger. The Kingdom of God to which the Church is committed will come by God's power not *in saeculo* but when the *saeculum* is finished.

ECUMENISM

While on a speaking tour of West Germany in the summer of 1953, Gus Weigel was asked what American Catholics were doing about ecumenism. He had to answer that they were not doing much, if anything. The question stayed with him throughout that summer.

The following year a slim mongraph entitled Survey of Protestant Theology in Our Day *was published by the Newman Press under the name of Gustave Weigel. From this modest start Gus Weigel proceeded to become the outstanding American spokesman for ecumenism. Other books followed, most notably* An American Dialogue, *which he co-authored with Robert McAfee Brown in 1960. More important than the books were the personal contacts he established with Protestant, Orthodox, and Jewish leaders, a background which made him so invaluable during the Council. In 1957 he was present as an official observer at the North American Conference on Faith and Order at Oberlin. In 1962 he was one of two American Catholics invited to the sessions of the Central Committee of the World Council of Churches held in Paris. He became very active in the National Conference of Christians and Jews. That same year Yale University bestowed upon him an honorary doctorate. President Alfred Whitney Griswold commended him as "a foremost interpreter of American pluralistic Protestantism . . . You have broken through the Reformation wall and pioneered in Catholic-Protestant dialogue. Your critical, yet sympathetic presentation of the beliefs of those with whom you disagree has already helped to create a new ecumenical climate in our country."*

The sermon below was delivered during the Chair of Unity Octave at St. Patrick's Cathedral in New York on January 21, 1960. "Modern Protestant Theological Positions" is the transcription of an evening at Regis College, Denver, in 1958. Not only is it indicative of his attitudes on ecumenism but one also gets a fair sampling of the Weigel style in question and answer sessions—usually the highpoint of the evening.

Sermon: Unity Octave, 1960

The Catholic believes that God through Jesus Christ, his true son, founded a holy community which is the Catholic Church. Catholics believe that this community is bound together vitally by the indwelling Holy Spirit who gives energy, activity and stability to the divine fellowship. Catholics believe that this fellowship is Christ prolonged in time and space and that God's revelation to mankind is communicated infallibly and constantly by the holy community. Catholics believe that only in this way does God communicate adequately his truth in our time and in all the times which followed on the saving death of Jesus. For a Catholic then, to reject the Church is to reject the Christ and to reject the Christ is to reject God.

Needless to say, only Catholics believe this. If non-Catholics believed it, they would logically become Catholics. The pull of consistency would force a man to enter the Church if he believed that she and she alone was appointed by God and his Christ to tell men the truth of God.

All Americans know the non-Catholic Christians who today are called Protestants. There are over sixty million of them in our land and every neighborhood has many in its midst. With them Catholics live, work and play. We Catholics are close to them and many a Catholic has members of his family who are Protestant. Needless to say we love them, for we are kin, friends and neighbors. This very love brings with it pain. Because as Catholics we believe that our Church is God's community in which he dwells and on which he showers his graces, we earnestly and anxiously want our friends to share with us the life of the Church. We know that their forefathers were in our Church side by side with ours, and we believe that the Church is their true home. They do not see it that way. Until they do, they will not join us. Nor do they look on the Church as their home.

How can we make them see what we see? In a very true sense, we cannot make them see it at all. This seeing must be produced by God the author of light. He must enlighten the soul for without

his light nothing which we may do can have the effect we so desire. We can pray that the Father give his illumination and this octave celebration is precisely structured for such prayer.

Can we do more? Beyond a doubt; we can and must do more. The faith in us brings forth love, and love gives. We must give the one thing we can, and that is the witness to the great things that God has shown us. Nor is it enough to give witness. It must be effective witness, which means a witness adjusted to the mind and heart of our Protestant friends. This adjustment demands above all an understanding of their position.

Such an understanding takes us into the history of four hundred years. It was in the sixteenth century that what is called Protestantism made its first appearance, and very early in its history it showed three tendencies. The first was predominant in Germany under the influence of Martin Luther, and produced our modern Lutheran Churches. The second tendency spread out from Switzerland and into France, Holland and the British Isles, and from there into America. This movement was formed in great part by John Calvin. There was a third strain in early Protestantism and it is still here. We can call it the free Bible interpretation of independent congregations. It is hard to name any one man as the dominant molder of this tradition. All three traditions fragmented into smaller groups and the traditions crossed to produce different forms of minor church-unions.

Concerning the Lutherans we must bear in mind two of their characteristics; one traditional and the other contemporary. Luther himself was a pious man, and his message fostered inwardness and dedication to God. He was also in many respects conservative, even though he was daring enough to shatter the unity of Christendom. He and his followers believed in the real physical presence of Christ in the Eucharist; he believed that revealed truth was one and the Christian must accept it all and entire; he held on to so much of the old religion that Johann Sebastian Bach could compose his glorious Masses which were written for Lutheran services. The consequences for Lutheran history have been decisive. The Lutheran churches have a feeling for orthodoxy and tradition which is lacking in most Protestant denominations. The Lutheran faith fosters a dignified cult and inward prayers. Coupled to these virtues we find Lutheranism inculcating a sound morality.

Contemporary Lutheranism

The contemporary characteristic of continental Lutheranism is its feeling of crisis. In the German Western Republic, Catholics and Lutherans are almost equally balanced numerically. In other words Lutheranism is no longer the normative religious pattern of the nation. The German Catholics have marched forward militantly in every area of German life: politics, art, philosophy, science and literature. The Lutherans have not kept pace with their Catholic neighbors. The evangelical pastors are doing much to resuscitate life and interest in their churches but in doing so, they have taken many weapons from the armory of the Catholics. Here and there, there is a return to the Catholic Mass and its liturgy. There is a campaign fostered by not a few Lutheran ministers to make private confession popular. There are Evangelical Academies established all over the land, where the program is like that found in Catholic Retreat Houses. In other words there is a Catholicizing wind blowing through German Lutheranism, though it is not a mighty wind.

But there is another wind blowing and it is more menacing. The Lutheran theologians are facing the question of modern man's capacity for accepting the old Lutheran faith as it orthodoxly existed for four centuries. Many believe that the man of today cannot take the Scriptures and the Lutheran confessions either in the letter or in the spirit in which these were composed. Hence we have the movement of Professor Rudolf Bultmann which wishes to demythologize the faith, and that means we must abandon belief in the miraculous, in the historicity of the biblical narratives, in the faithful evolution of the gospel as developed through the centuries. If this movement grows widely, it will be the end of Lutheran orthodoxy. It may never become decisive, but in the meantime it is weakening the faith of many. In spite of the efforts of zealous pastors the adherence to the Lutheran Church on the part of many German Lutherans is languid.

This languidity is even more manifest in the Scandinavian countries. Wonderful theological work is being done in Sweden, where many of the Catholic elements in Lutheranism are being analyzed and developed in the light of sober Scripture study. Yet the people at large seem to take the Church as something peripheral to their lives, nor are they guided by the Church in morals or in their world

vision. Catholicism here is very weak, and it offers no threat to the national Lutheran Churches, but this very absence gives more power to the apathy which pervades the man of the street.

The continental Lutheran Church has always been the heart of continental Protestantism. Most of the great Protestant movements of Europe had their origin in the German lands; orthodoxy, pietism, sentimentalism, historicism, liberalism, and the biblical revival. Such German movements were exported and modified elsewhere, but the thought of the German Lutherans has always served as a ferment within Protestantism as a whole. The return of continental Lutherans to Catholicism would certainly lead Protestants elsewhere to think seriously of reunion with the Mother Church.

Is there any foreseeable probability for such an event? A Catholic might hopefully see in the conversions of a few German Lutheran ministers a straw in the wind. The enthusiastic adoption of Catholic liturgy in not a few German Lutheran Churches might mean a growing sympathy for Catholicism. The breaking-down of the barriers of mistrust and antipathy which divided German Catholics and Lutherans might be a sign of ultimate reunion. Yet on sober reflection these phenomena do not mean a change of heart in German Lutherans. By and large their faith in Lutheranism is strong and their conviction that the Catholic Church is not the Church of Christ is fervent.

Inner crisis

It is not so much the Catholicizing elements in current continental Lutheranism which possibly foreshadow a Lutheran return to the Church. What could be more significant is the inner crisis of the German Evangelicals. Must orthodoxy be dropped and something quite different from the older Lutheran spirit be adopted? There is great danger latent in this question. It opens up the possibility that something utterly new and, from the traditional stand-point, utterly strange will take the place of the Lutheranism which history has known. If such a situation should arise many a Lutheran would have to face a fearful choice. The believing Lutheran is one formed in the doctrines of the Augsburg Confession and in the Formula of Concord. If he finds that the new Lutheranism wishes to deny all that he was taught to believe, he will find an attraction in Catholicism which preserves the substance

of the Lutheran symbols better than the new vision could. A time of crisis is also a moment of grace, and grace can do what dialectic and rhetoric can never bring about.

Our Catholic witness must take the form of appreciation for the deep concern of Lutherans for the Word of God. We must manifest to them that such a concern is thoroughly Catholic. We must by word and work show them that whatever they have discovered in Scripture and prayer is stored up for them intact in their Father's house, the holy Church. There is no time to quarrel, for the moment is too serious and the enemy of Catholicism and Lutheranism is beating on the walls. If our brethren see that we act in unselfish love and that in fellowship with us they can effectively preserve their Gospel-faith, they will be drawn to the Church and God's grace will bring them in.

But above all we must pray. Only God can do God's work, and only in prayer can we prepare ourselves and our Protestant friends for light and grace. We must root out hatred from our own hearts, and sincere prayer for our friends will itself induce affection which casts out hatred. Through love and prayer before the throne of God can we become effective witnesses for Lutherans and other Protestants whereby they can become the sheep of the one Shepherd in his one fold.

Modern Protestant Theological Positions

Q. [Audience at Regis College] Here are four closely related problems: (1) What importance does Luther hold for Protestants today? (2) Do Lutherans profess to follow the teachings of Martin Luther? (3) How do Lutherans feel today about Luther's stand that man can do nothing but sin? (4) How do Lutherans feel about the doctrine of faith without good works, and could you give an honest explanation of the doctrine?

A. [Weigel] These questions were obviously written by Catholics who don't know anything about what they are writing. No Lutheran, including Luther himself, ever believed that they were following Luther. Luther never believed that he founded a church.

Any Lutheran will tell you that he believes in God and not in Luther, and this was right from the beginning. Luther himself always became angry when they said that they were following Luther. He said, "Who is Luther that you should follow him?" Luther saw the Christian message in a certain way, and as he saw the message he felt it was the essence of Christianity. And to be Christian, therefore, you had to follow this. His own life was an extraordinary, complicated thing; but he had no intention of founding a church, nor did he. He introduced what is called the Reform into the church which was existing in Saxony and other parts of Germany. Now, he has, of course, a prominent position in Lutheran affection. This is only natural. Jesuits do not believe that they are following St. Ignatius of Loyola—but they certainly think very highly of him, and they think the way he put things together is very wise, and very sound, and very holy. But actually we Jesuits like to think that we are following God. There are many in the world who think that we are all wrong, but this is what we believe. Now get that straight once and for all. Luther founded no church. No Lutheran believes in Luther. In fact, this Lutheran thing is more an American thing than German. The true name for Lutheranism in Germany is the Evangelical Church. *Evangelisch*, not Lutheran. Just like Calvinist churches in Germany are not called Calvinist—in fact in Europe by and large they are not called that—they are called Reformed. So all that Luther was trying to do was to bring back the church where he was to its proper essence. We as Catholics believe that he was completely mistaken; but Luther was certainly not trying to start another church. Since this is so, and since every Lutheran understands this very well, he likewise realizes he doesn't have to follow Luther in anything. Luther laid it down that you find it in the Scripture. It is true that he found certain things in the Scriptures, and those who find the same things with him can be called to that degree Lutheran. But there is no obligation of a Lutheran to follow Luther. If he goes back to Scriptures and finds the doctrine there, in that sense he is Lutheran. . . .

Now about this doctrine of total depravity, and so forth. Luther held this; of course, actually Calvin gave it a rougher rhetoric than Luther did. And Luther by and large was a very jovial fellow; don't think that he went miserable through life. This is the kind of man you would like to have around at a party, but I don't think that you

would like to have Calvin around at a party. He was a bit of a wet blanket, but Luther was a nice fellow. Strangely enough the doctrine which we consider so highly characteristic of Calvin, namely the doctrine of predestination—the impossibility of achieving faith and virtue unless grace takes over—this doctrine is not commonly held by Calvinistic churches. They have taken the Arminian side which was a development within Calvinism (Arminius was a Dutch theologian) stressing free will. Man could by his free will approach God. Today it is not the Calvinist church nor even the Lutheran church that will stress heavily predestination. There is only one church in our time stresses predestination and has always done so, that's the Roman Catholic Church. Predestination is one of the dogmas that every Catholic must believe.

They once asked a very devout Scotch lady who was an orthodox member of a very orthodox kirk. They said to her, "Mrs. McIntosh, do you really believe in the total depravity of man?" She sighed and said, " 'Tis a saving doctrine if you can live up to it." But Calvin never taught total depravity. Luther never taught total depravity, though this word was, of course, used. What they were teaching is what the Catholic Church taught before them and still teaches; that since man is born under original sin, he cannot perform true virtue unless God calls him by the grace of faith and conversion. Only through faith and conversion, because of God's grace working in man, can man produce *true* virtue. If you want to say, "Because he didn't hit his poor old mother in the head with a club, to that extent he was good," neither Calvin, nor Augustine, nor Paul, nor Aquinas would deny this. They would really say that this is the kind of virtue that doesn't make much difference. The virtue we're interested in is the virtue that would put you into ultimate union with God. And unless grace be given, this kind of virtue is impossible for fallen man. This is the doctrine of Paul, this is the doctrine of Augustine, the doctrine of Aquinas, the doctrine of Calvin, the doctrine of Luther, and the doctrine of the Catholics today. It is actually the Calvinists who are not fond of this doctrine anymore. Now, this does not deny freedom of the will; Calvin made quite clear in his *Institutes* that freedom of the will in the sense that you choose or don't choose—certainly he granted that. Certainly, he said, that was there, but that wasn't important. Can you or can you not perform true virtue with your fallen nature? He said, you

can't. You will only be able to perform true virtue if God's grace is given to you after you have made your act of faith and love. So the doctrine is not at all nonsensical. The doctrine does not deny freedom of the will. What the doctrine denies is the capacity of man, born in the present situation, to perform virtue which is of supernatural value. That is all it denies.

Extreme rhetoric

The drawback, both with Luther and with Calvin on this question, was that they used extreme rhetoric. To bring home the doctrine they overstated it. Actually this happens all the time in all kinds of things. If I want my class to understand that the two automobiles were very close to each other, I will say they were nose-to-nose, a word, I suppose a man like me shouldn't use, however. . . . Now actually there were three feet between the cars, but if I tell them there were three feet, that is not close, so I overstate the closeness. I do not expect to be taken literally. I am trying to emphasize the closeness. Now that is certainly one of the difficulties, both with Luther and Calvin, in preaching the incapacity of nature for supernatural virtue: they overstate their case. But as I put it, I think you will see there is no problem; the thing is evident. Nature, certainly by the very notion that it is nature, is incapable of supernatural virtue. This is the doctrine. Now since nature is incapable of it, nothing that nature can do can bring on supernatural virtue. What is needed now is divine grace. God gives graciously, graciously *gives* grace, and then the individual can be doing it.

Faith without works. Again, as I have explained to you, what makes your works pleasing in the sight of God? Because they are yours? No. They're pleasing in the sight of God because He gave you the grace whereby these works are performed. What they're saying is that if you have works, so called good deeds, which are not the fruit and grace, these are not really works that count. Not for salvation. The kind of works we need are not the ones that we dig out of our own depths, but are the works that God's grace in me makes possible. Luther, Calvin, and Protestants in general will insist they are not against good works. Did you ever hear of the Puritans? Are they against good works? Most of you would be dry for years and years if you were Puritans. They believe in good

works, but they do not believe that the good work itself is what makes you good. What makes you good is God's grace, and by God's grace then you will do good works. You're saved not by the works; you're saved by the grace. Now Catholics actually teach the same thing.

Q. How do you define the church according to Catholic theology? Does it exclude both members and God in saying that it is the medium between the two?

A. A union is a different kind of a thing than a unity. If I have a union, I have at least two things, which are so related to each other that they are one in some sense. The way I can unite two of these bricks is by putting a medium between them: mortar. Then they become one. I am united to you in terms of vision because I have glasses on. I put a medium between me and you, not to keep you out but to bring you in. If two are to become one, you need a medium of some kind. And this is precisely the Catholic doctrine of church. The thing that binds me to God and binds God to me is the holy Community. It doesn't separate us any more than the mortar separates the bricks: it brings them together; or that these glasses separate me from you: they join me to you. This is the way the union is produced through a medium.

Q. What are the positions of the three groups on the Holy Eucharist?

A. Oh, dear! This is hard, really. Protestants usually resent something that Catholics say, and I think Catholics say it with pride. It was a Catholic wit that said, Catholics believe in the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist and Protestants believe in the real absence. Now this is what today's theologians, except the liberals, take great pains to deny. Now Luther himself believed in the physical presence of Christ in the Eucharist. And this he taught and refused to come into a kind of unity with the Swiss Reformed on this question. In the Marburg Colloquy, (he wasn't very anxious to go in the first place) when they went to the table where they were going, he pulled off the table cloth, and wrote with his finger on the table "hoc est corpus meum"—this is my body. He said, "Now, what do you make of that?" He insisted that that means, this is my body. What he objected to was philosophy, and in this,

Calvin was the same. They were not kindly minded to the philosophers. Therefore he hated the word transubstantiation, but had a theory of his own which is sometimes called impanation or companation, but it dropped out of Lutheran thought after Luther's death. It's too clumsy a concept. But he believed in physical presence, and Orthodox rightist movements today will believe in the real physical presence of Christ in the Eucharist. Liberal theologians, of course, just don't believe in any such thing. That is bread and that's all it is. And this bread is used by us in a memorial service, just like the Jewish *Seder*, the Passover meal; they don't think that God is in the lamb. This recalls to them the old Passover when they left Egypt. The center people talk from both sides of their mouths. Christ is really present, but it's bread. They insist on real presence, and they prefer the Calvinist formula, he is spiritually present. But they insist today that it's a real presence, not a real absence. I find their doctrine just a little bit too heady for the kind of logic I am accustomed to.

Q. What is Gabriel Marcel's Christian existential relation to the forms you mentioned?

A. None.

Q. What is the position of Mormon theology? Can it be placed in any one of the categories you have mentioned?

A. Of course the Mormon church is a little distinct from the others. First of all, they do not want to be called Protestants. They are not at all pleased with the United States' Army, Navy, and Air Force, because, according to the Army, Navy, and Air Force, a Mormon is a Protestant. The Navy settles these things very easily. But they don't want to be in any sense Protestant. Ah, but they don't want to be Catholics either. Their position is rendered a little bit difficult because in addition to the Bible they have their own added sources of revelation: the Rock of Mormon, the Pearl of Great Price and the "something" of Joe Smith. These are all books of revelation, and likewise the president of the church can give revelation. So they have a constant and progressive revelation. So they won't quite fit into anything I have said. But in mood, in mentality, they are fundamentalists. . . .

Q. Both the theologians of the center and right claim St. Augus-

time in some way as a special spiritual ancestor. Would you care to comment on this?

A. Actually I have commented on it already. If you read the *Institutes* of Calvin, which was his attempt at a systematic presentation of reformed doctrine, you will find St. Augustine cited approvingly over 175 times. He liked Augustine. Luther likewise was led to his own particular views on faith and on human incapacity by the reading of St. Augustine. St. Augustine certainly was the first man who dealt with the whole problem of virtue and human capacity at length. You will find it touched upon in the letters of Paul, but it takes Augustine to develop this into a doctrine; and because Augustine did develop it, it became a source of disputations and controversy in his time which did help to clarify the position of the Church. Augustine is an extraordinary, fine mind, a man of great breadth of vision. At the same time he is not systematic, and has a tremendous passion. He does not, therefore, talk in terms of syllogisms. He doesn't reason coldly. His reasoning takes place in what you might call existentialist warmth. Now this kind of a man certainly would please Martin Luther, and his thought on this question of the incapacity of the human nature for its own salvation, and his high recognition of God's sovereignty made him pleasing also to Calvin. . . .

Q. If Christ is thought of as the ultimate example for man, then aren't some of these Protestant concepts basically Jewish?

A. Well, yeh, what of it? Don't we all believe that He was the son of David? Don't we all believe that He was the anointed one —the Messiah? Aren't we all spiritually Semites?

Protestant mergers

Q. Since some of the Protestant churches have merged, apparently assuming a common philosophy or theology (that doesn't follow at all), do you feel there will be more mergers, eventually leading to one Protestant denomination?

A. See, someone dragged in the ecumenical movement which I didn't want to discuss because it is a whole subject by itself. Let's take the Baptist church. Any Baptist church within the Baptist denomination, and let's take the Quakers, and let's take the Methodists. These are noncreedal churches. They have no creed. The

Episcopal Church, of course, has the old creed, the Nicene creed, the Athanasian creed; it has the 39 Articles. The Presbyterian Church owes some kind of allegiance to the Westminster Confession. The Lutherans—I have already indicated their symbolic books and documents. But these other churches have no creed. In other words, they allow the creedal part of their church life to the individual. Therefore, for noncreedal churches to unite, there is no problem of a common philosophy and a common theology. They can do it without it. What about creedal churches? There is no problem of the Congregationalist Church joining with the Presbyterian Church. The Congregationalist will certainly accept the Westminister Confession, as will most of the Presbyterians. And both churches will give to their members now amplitude in the understanding of these creeds. A very dear friend of mine, who is a Congregationalist minister, and a very intelligent man, well schooled—we have worked together for a couple of months—and we were talking about the creed. Now he, as a Congregationalist, recited with his congregation the Apostle's Creed. And I said to him, "Look here, what do you understand when you say 'And rose again from the dead on the third day'?" And he said, "You know, Gus, I don't understand anything." Well I said to him, "Do you believe?" He said, "Yes, I believe something wonderful took place on the third day, but I wouldn't say that." And I said, "But what would you like to say?" He said, "Nothing." Well, this man was very sincere and very intelligent. I said, "All right, how about the last words: 'And I believe in the resurrection of the flesh'? Now what do you understand when you say that?" He said, "I just have my tongue in my cheek."

Now, this was a very good man, a good Congregationalist in every sense, and ordained. And he felt that he was not being disloyal to his Congregationalist Church; and yet, of the Apostle's Creed, he didn't accept too much. So, therefore, it wouldn't necessarily be important that they have the same creedal forms. The tendency, of course, is today, and it is going to grow stronger, to more and more mergers. There is no reason in the world why the Universalists and the Unitarians couldn't be one church. There is no reason in the world why the Presbyterian church which is, of course, united with the United Brethren, shouldn't be one with the Congregationalists and all the other Calvinist forms. In doctrine

and in quality, they're pretty much the same. These churches could easily get together; one wonders why they didn't. Quite earlier, you know, in the late 30's, most of the big Methodist Churches came together to form the Methodist Church of America. They united the Methodist Episcopal with the Methodist Protestant. There was no reason why these two churches should be separated, and therefore the merger was most rational. . . .

Are we ultimately going to have one Protestant church? I don't think so. The fundamentalists certainly do not want to join up with what they consider to be people who are not Christian at all. And fundamentalism is not by any means completely dead. It will evolve undoubtably and become a little bit more Leftish, but I don't think it will get Leftist to the point where a Baptist is going to shake hands with a Unitarian. That's just a little bit too much.

I'm being kicked out. Thank you.

RELIGION AND INVOLVEMENT IN SOCIETY

Latin-America had seared deep within him the consciousness of a need for the Church to concern itself with the agonizing social problems of modern mankind. Some of his earliest published writings were on social questions. The areas of concern only became more awesome in the world that was born out of World War II. Despite his involvement with Latin America, theology, education, and ecumenism, Gus Weigel devoted much of his thought to social issues. Communism, population control, the ethical effects of automation, the morality of modern warfare, McCarthyism—all were realities he attempted to come to grips with and make Christian judgments upon.

"The Left and the Right" appears to date from the twilight days of McCarthyism in the mid-fifties. "What Makes a Prophet a Prophet" was originally read at the Jewish Theological Seminary in the winter of 1960. The final selection, "Our Religious Crisis," was a radio tape prepared for the American Episcopal Church.

The Left and the Right

It is hard to say if there is more hysteria in the present than in other days. Certainly the human situation at any time to some degree foments hysterical action in society. It is equally certain that the brooding menace of war and upheaval so characteristic of our moment is churning up electric feelings in all of our communities. It should be the effort of all at a time like this to make great efforts to reduce hysteria. It can only cause panic and panic brings on needless tragedy and destruction. Yet it is useless to shout to all and sundry that we must be calm. The advice is appropriate enough but the mere statement of a truth rarely brings about the action which truth counsels. However, an analysis of our situation may help to bring out the truth better than an exhortation to follow it.

Perhaps men and women anxious to avoid affiliation with either the right or the left see mounting emotional tensions more clearly than others. This is especially true of so many Catholics who are unjustly labeled as "liberal" or "radical." They find themselves suspected and even bitterly attacked by their fellow-Catholics while non-Catholics look on them as wily infighters. In consequence such persons are spiritually lonely and must seek comfort from the small fraternity which thinks as they do. In such loci, unfortunately, they will find a fringe of Bohemians, crackpots and unbalanced zealots. These are the individuals who strike the public eye and give the entire group a bad name.

The modern use of the words left and right derives from the fact that, beginning in France, the political parties proposing drastic changes in the social framework used the benches of the left side of the parliament, while the defenders of the *status quo ante* sat on the right. In the contemporary use of the words, the leftist stands for the destruction of the old in order to bring in something new, which by his assumption must be better, while the rightist defends what is traditional, which in his assumption is the best. Much emotion can go into these stands, and soon we find that the leftist wishes to get rid of the old just because it is old and the rightist wants to avoid the new just because it is new. When this stage is reached, it is obvious that both positions are irrational. The accidental fact that something is old neither guarantees that it is

good nor that it is bad. Instead of asking if the thing be old, we should ask if the thing is good. Then and then alone can we deal with it reasonably. As in all human things, a survival will have elements of benefit and elements of evil. The true task of society is to scrutinize the elements and then pare off the bad and energize the good. Every householder knows that with time his house becomes inadequate for the family's needs. He must change. He can do so by remodelling what he has, or if that is not economical, he will buy or build anew. But he will always be careful to preserve in the later house the permanent values of the old.

Leftism and rightism are ideologies—abstract programs for action exclusivistically and fanatically proposed or maintained. Like all ideologies, they are impracticable because they ignore the structure of the existent world we live in. Since they are fanatical, they will on principle oppressively coerce men and society because these must be totally remade if the ideology is to work. Ideology overlooks the basic truth that man is an abiding datum and not a project to be realized.

In the United States Catholicism has gone through a process of evolution. This evolution has been conditioned in part by the economic amelioration of the Catholic group and in part by its thorough assimilation into its American background. This is datum; not an abstract thesis waiting to be discussed. The present stage of evolution pleases some and others regret it. In either case, the emotional reaction cannot undo the fact. One of the consequences of the evolution is the ever growing number of American Catholics, both lay and clerical, equipped through better education for an intelligent and informed criticism of our Catholic reality. To criticize does not mean to condemn; it only means to judge and evaluate, actions which are spontaneous to an educated mind.

The Catholic critic

A penetrating critic does not follow a party line. He compares the principles basic to the phenomenon under discussion with the existent reality to see if the actualization of the idea is really the best possible expression of the idea. A Catholic, educated or uneducated, by definition believes in the Catholic Church. If he is an intelligent observer of the Catholic reality, he will criticize it according to the genuine doctrine on which the Church stands. To

make such a criticism is not a sign of defective Catholicism but rather the necessary consequence of lived faith. It need not be surprising if in concrete circumstances the Catholic critic will pass adverse judgment on facets of the concrete Catholicism he encounters. Only one who supposes that the Church is without flaw or blemish in its historic existence would be surprised by such criticism. Catholic tradition looks with admiration on many of its sons who were eloquently outspoken in their castigation of the Catholic reality which they experienced. Salvian of Marseilles was a trenchant though not always fair critic of the Gallic Church of which he was a luminary. St. Bernard fulminated against the evils he found in the Church of his times. Dante in criticism sent a sainted pope to his poetic hell. Bl. Peter Faber and St. Peter Canisius who worked in the German lands were forthright in their strictures on the Catholicism they found. Undoubtedly there were in those times Catholics, clerical and lay, who were irritated and annoyed with these great men, but Catholic tradition holds up the critics as true Catholics, better than those who opposed them.

Universally venerated saints did not fear to propose new measures and abandon old institutions. In spite of the opposition of the Catholic University of Paris, St. Thomas successfully made Aristotelianism the framework of his theological scheme. Though opposed by churchmen high and low, St. Ignatius Loyola, that apostle of obedience, stubbornly fought for something unheard of, a religious order in which choir had no place.

One thing is clear in Catholic history: criticism and crusades for renewal are marks of sterling Catholics.

In a Catholic context, then, criticism and the advocacy of certain concrete changes is not a sign of leftism. The prophetic charism is something freely given to the Church at large nor is it the monopoly of those in Orders. One prophetic function is to criticize. St. Catherine of Siena emphatically urging Gregory XI to leave Avignon and return to Rome was exercising the prophetic charism and she was not ordained. Of course we know that there are false prophets, but let us not on that account suppress prophecy itself. Even if we try, we shall not be able to do so, for prophecy is God's gift, and man cannot withstand God. Jonah tried to do so but he did not succeed.

Though criticism and movements toward renovation are not leftism, the universal opposition to these things is rightism, a thing as vicious as leftism itself. This is often overlooked because it is socially dangerous to be a leftist, though quite safe to be of the right. The ideological nature of rightism is manifested always in its narrowness, fanatical rigidity and formalism. The rightist betrays himself by his ruthless and aggressive vehemence against all those who do not share his stubborn intransigence. His overriding preoccupation is the defense of orthodoxy (usually of the do-it-yourself variety) so that Christian charity, gentlemanly tolerance and even plain fairness find no place in his polemic.

Fortunately for us, the pure Catholic rightist is rare, though not as rare as the pure Catholic leftist. One of our present malaises comes from neither of them but rather from something less, the Catholics who are "rightish." Some of these are Polyannas who close their eyes to all our deficiencies and magnify our little victories. The fact that little Jimmy Kelly of St. Elipandus School was chosen for the All-City junior basketball team is widely broadcast as somehow religiously significant. But the quality of the teaching at St. Elipandus is not considered, for it is not permitted even to dream of the possibility that it is not superior to all the institutions in the county, with the exception, of course, of one's own parish school.

But not all are Polyannas. There are others who cannot see the difference between the order of absolute truth and the order of its practical application to historical relativity. A weird logic dominates their thinking. They hold, like all other Catholics, that the Church's magisterium is the infallible communicator of God's revealed truth. Like any other Catholic, they hold that the hierarchy is divinely empowered to direct authoritatively the practical life of the Church. Then comes the logically fatal leap: therefore, whatever concretely faces us is either commanded or positively permitted by the holy Church. Local institutions and provisional arrangements cannot be criticized without denying the authority and infallibility of the hierarchy.

This muddled logic is typical of the "rightish" mind. It fallaciously fuses different orders of things in simplicist fashion. The fact that the ecumenical magisterium is infallible in handing down Christ's

revelation and the regimen rules with God-given authority does not imply that all practical policies and determinations of the temporal order are necessarily the best, the most prudent, the most convenient. Nor is it to be thought that the bishop wills or even positively permits all that is going on. Many things escape his attention and other things he helplessly tolerates because there is nothing else he can do. The fact that there are clerical champions of this movement or that situation does not imply that the whole Church or even the local bishop has pronounced a blessing on it. The opinion of a priest or of a diocesan paper is not necessarily the fruit of divine revelation nor does it command more allegiance than the evidence brought forth in its favor. The Church does indeed speak through these media, but not all they say or print is the word of the Church.

Not anti-clericalism

It is the kind of language I have used here—in substance utterly innocuous—which shocks the "rightish" mind. To it this spells treasonable anti-clericalism. Yet as a rule the Catholic who speaks this kind of language has in theory and practice more regard for the priest than the rightist clerical who only patronizes the clergy, condescendingly, cynically (and often successfully) hitching them to his car. It is not anti-clerical to recognize the limitations of the clergy. If it were, the Church herself would be anti-clerical since she obliges every priest before the altar of God to confess to the congregation that he has sinned exceedingly in thought, word and deed. Ah no, recoils the pious "rightish" mind. The *confiteor* of the priest attests to his humility, not to his deficiencies! A gentle interpretation indeed, but hardly consonant with the hard realism of the liturgy.

But must we not be loyal to the Church and her pastors? Beyond doubt, yes. But this very loyalty made St. Paul resist Peter to his face. Neither Peter nor Paul suffered thereby. It is more than whimsical fancy to think that the great Keybearer, after a moment of hurt, was glad in the Lord and grateful to his subordinate for having shown him a better way.

The "rightish" mind is not formed by Catholic dogma. It is the product of apologetic timorousness and insecurity. In consequence it craves an unbroken solid front, because it conceives Catholicism

primarily as a beleaguered host hard pressed by enemies. Tight unity against the foe is considered to be the great desideratum. Consequently critical observations even though well intentioned and solidly grounded are out of place because they give aid and comfort to the enemy. The "rightish" mind will reluctantly admit that to make reservations concerning the adequacy of policy does not mean disobedience on the part of the dissenters, who like all good Catholics manfully strive to obey ecclesiastical directives. But they point out the harm it does to the simple faithful, who so easily misunderstand. Hence sincere and filial dissent, possible or even laudable in the abstract, is out of place in the concrete situation because it weakens our position. The unexamined assumption of this reflection is that we Catholics are alone and on our own, overwhelmed by fiendish hordes. It is overlooked that "I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world." It is not seriously remembered that our true power is from Him who strengthens us, not from rigid uniformity and organization. All "rightish" fear is needless, for He has overcome the world and His Spirit is the indwelling strength of the Church.

The "rightish" mind is always tense because of its defensive preoccupations. One result is an exaggerated sensitivity to words and phrases. When an informed and loyal Catholic in some utterance, whose evident purpose is the edification of the Church, makes remarks suggesting an error on our part, the "rightish" mind pounces on such driblets and then forms an independent syllabus of the culled sentences. The result then inspires horror. Nor is this amazing, for when propositions are wrenched out of their context and lined up to show a tendency never present in the original, a frightening chimera is born. The Bible itself, if subjected to such treatment, can be construed to have pornographic leanings. The "rightish" mind easily falls into this trap because of its refusal to take Original Sin seriously. The dogma itself is accepted academically but a realistic recognition of its living presence among us is treason.

One and many

But why beat so hard on the "rightish" mind? Is there no "leftish" mind as well. Yes, there is, and it is no handsomer apparition. We meet it not infrequently. It manifests itself in the querulous critic

who sees only defects in all that is done. He points out naggingly the flaws in every effort. He is never appreciative of the concrete good because he always compares it with the abstract better. Nothing meets with his generous approval because he finds nothing perfect. From his talk one would erroneously conclude that he believes things are so much rosier beyond our confines; that non-Catholics do things better so that nothing is left us but to imitate them wholly. This man, no less than his opposite, is not resigned to the fact of Original Sin. Its inevitable infiltration into good projects makes him angry and contentious. He forgets that hope and patience are the prime requisites for earthly Christian living. He ovelooks the glorious paradox that God makes even the wrath of men to praise Him, and the Church, mother of sinners, is holy in spite of them. However, real though the "leftish" mind is, it does not seem to be epidemic. The malaise produced by it can be considered to be minor nor need we delay longer on it.

Left and right—a plague on both your houses! Temperament and environment tend to drag every individual toward one of these extremes. I suppose we can't help that. However, in action and discourse it would be wise for everyone to resist his own tendency. The paradox of the Church is that we are simultaneously one and many. Both elements belong to our fellowship by God's grace and intent, nor do we honor God by trying to eliminate one of the components of His divine work.

In his day St. Paul urged the Christians to shun factions and divisions. As he teaches, tolerance bred by charity, hope based on faith, are the virtues a strong Catholic life demands. These are, of course, gifts of God and not the fruits of Pelagian effort. Yet witness must be given, and having given it, let there be an end.

Our Religious Crisis

In every epoch of human history, organized religion is on the verge of dying. But it never dies. The religious men will say that God will not let it die and many a non-religious man will say that it corresponds to some indestructible need in man. Actually both answers are right, and for our immediate purpose either answer will do. The zeal of many Attilas to eradicate religion from the hearts

of men has been dazzling: frightening those to whom religion is dear and consoling those who look on religion as an aberration or a throwback to mankind's childhood. Time, however, proved that neither religion's lover nor its foe had reason for his strong emotions. Whether you love it or hate it, religion ebbs and flows in the story of our kind, but its movement cannot be suppressed.

In our day we once more see a struggle. One political force in our world is bent on driving religion out of the world, and against it, men and women are rising in opposition to the destroyers. There is a tension in the air and the religious question is once more thrust on man's attention. He must today choose either to abandon it or give it allegiance. This clear challenge is healthy and on its response will depend the culture of the future. As we have said, religion will not disappear, no matter what be our generation's choice. At worst, it may have to retire to caves and catacombs; at best, it will visibly influence the structure erected for our common life.

A word must be said to those who consider themselves the friends of faith. In their efforts to enhance the fortunes of religion, they may actually be contributing their energies, not to religion itself, but rather to some religious situation of the past. They really want to bring back a moment that is gone. It is only wise to tell them that their enterprise is doomed to failure. Religion will be with us in the morrow, but it will take on a shape which fits tomorrow. It may influence future culture heavily or lightly. It will do one of the two, for the simple reason that it will be around. Culture cannot flourish without deriving some of its life blood from faith. But such faith may be in an idol, and not in God himself. If such should be our fate, it is easy to say what the distant future will bring. A false faith brings on a false culture which cannot long survive the test of reality. True and false are human answers to the questions of reality, and reality can only back the truth.

The religious question

Friends of religion are truly so, if they are interested only in raising the religious question. They must not take on the needless task of saving religion itself. The chances are great that what they are doing is attempting to save a past modality of religious life.

Because it is past, it is outmoded and it is withering away. Crusaders for the religious cause must examine well the objectives they have in mind. They need not worry about the survival of faith. It will survive. They need not try to bring back some dead or dying form of it, for they cannot.

Yet the burden of this message is not to do nothing. The man of faith, because of his faith, must constantly question his neighbor about God. He must not impose answers, for living faith is a personal decision which cannot be forced. The cultural situation of the immediate future is not the religious question. Most of us want that culture to be effective and propitious, but its shape comes forth with a spontaneity no man can control.

As prophets of old, we must urge our age to choose between Baal and Yahweh. This is a free choice and must be made by free men. The free man is unpredictable and we can never be sure how he will react. But no matter how he reacts, over him in love and serenity, Yahweh will rule.

What Makes a Prophet a Prophet?

The notion of seer and clairvoyant is not typical of any one human group; it is characteristic of the whole human family. Yet in English the word prophet, if unmodified, usually induces the image of the Hebrew *nabhi*. Concerning the *nabhi* all that we can know phenomenologically is what is told us in the Hebrew scriptures. The New Testament prophet is not too clearly described nor can we be quite sure just what his function was. For the *nabhi* we have much more data, even though it is difficult to construct a unified concept from the scattered biblical descriptions.

Much has been written in the last two thousand years concerning the prophet and we notice different conceptions appearing at different periods of the investigation. The simplest conception which was in general vogue up to the 18th century and is not yet dead, is that the prophet is a man grasped by the unique personal God to become a divine mouthpiece. The divine grasping is an awesome experience and it may take the form of a voice or a vision or a dream. With the experience comes a felt compulsion to speak to another or others of what was experienced. Fundamentalists ac-

cepted the written account of the prophetic message as the literal word of God himself so that the prophet is considered as no more productive than a telephone is in a telephonic conversation. Today this fundamentalist approach, though not without its champions, is not typical of our time and culture.

Under the wind of the Enlightenment in the 18th and 19th centuries a completely different view of prophetism was held. A distinction was made between the prophets of Israel up to the ninth century before our era, and the literary prophets whose works begin to appear in the eighth century. The early *nebhiim* were intoxicated men and women who induced hysteria in themselves by dancing and shouting during which they proclaimed messages which were accepted as oracles. Some fell into trances and in the trance spoke. They might therefore have been mediums not unlike the spiritualists of our day. Many were no better than gpysy fortune tellers. In this heterogeneous class not a few were sincere, though deluded or even psychotic, while others were cynical charlatans using their prestige for selfish or political ends.

But the class as a whole produced a literary genre and this literary form was used by the rhapsodist reformers of the later time. These men were serious, devout and intelligent believers with a message for the people, castigating them for their sins and threatening them with foreseen calamity if reform were not forthcoming. These men were not visionaries, trance speakers or neurotics. They still used the language of vision and dream, but they did so merely as a literary device. They spoke from their own religious faith, keen understanding of the times, and human indignation. They were preachers who wrote their sermons instead of giving them, or perhaps teachers whose words were written by others. Of these eighth century prophets, Isaiah was the most honored because of his high literary skill.

In this view of the *nebhiim*, the early prophets were either deceived or deceivers. It was mere superstition which gave them any religious significance. The later prophets were men of insight but there was nothing supernatural about the acquisition of their message. They were a reforming influence on the religion of Israel and their writings were deservedly preserved for the religious growth of later generations.

This view was based on the postulate either that there was no personal God or that divine intrusion into history was impossible. What made the prophets "tiek" eould be discovered by the psychologists and historians of culture. The thinkers who so explained prophecy were not necessarily hostile to the Bible, but they felt that the Bible could be esteemed only if it were explained by the principles of naturalism.

The reaction of non-scholarly believers was bewilderment and dismay. The view of the historicists and rationalists made the Bible a most unreliable book. Above all, the notion of foretelling so common in the conservative view of propheey disappeared altogether. A crisis had developed in western religion which was Judeo-Christian and the crisis was painful. Some religious thinkers felt that the only honest thing to do was to accept the views of the historicists and build a new structure out of the ruins of the old. These were the men who produced Reform Judaism, Liberal Protestantism and the Modernist episode in Catholicism. Others felt that the liberals must be fought tooth and nail and in the fight they organized fundamentalism.

Yet neither solution was palatable to believers at large and it was felt that the matter must be solved in some other way. They saw eertain values in the conservative position and certain values on the liberal side. They wished to reseue these values and their cause was labeled as neo-orthodoxy because they moved over to a conservative view; it was simultaneously neo-liberalism because some basic stands of liberalism were retained.

Under the wind of existentialism blowing over the west, a new theory of Bible and prophetism has slowly come to clarity. This vision was to be neither naturalistic nor supernaturalistie. It was felt that with sueh a set of categories no progress could be made.

God and revelation

Two questions were logically previous to the approach to the scriptures. The first was the knowability of God and the other was the meaning of revelation. Concerning the knowability of God a basis was adopted which was quite genuine to both Jewish and Christian traditions. The holy name was ineffable; He was utterly other. Human concepts could not be applied literally to Him. Yet he could be known in an experience whieh is called faith. This

experience was not natural in the sense of positivistic naturalism, nor was it supernatural in the sense of the conservatives opposed to the positivists. It could be called either but should be called neither. The knowledge of God was achieved in a perception which stands outside of the epistemological categories constructed by the philosophers. The perception was immediate, though occasioned by time and anxiety. Paul Tillich sees the locus of this perception in the final temptation to scepticism, despair and horror of death. Martin Buber puts the locus in the meeting of man and God through an I-Thou relationship discovered in cosmic reality which is the divine *shekhinah*, simultaneously divine and non-divine. For Tillich God is the ground of being and man's ultimate concern. For Buber God is the great Thou who is also the ultimate I.

This perception of God recognizes that He is ineffable, but in spite of that ineffability, much can be meaningfully said about Him. However, the propositions used are not to be taken literally, for this would make God something finite, limited and relative. That is idolatry. All affirmations are symbolic, pointers to God's reality as perceived in faith; they are not logical statements. In consequence all statements concerning God are paradoxical; they affirm and deny simultaneously without being involved in contradiction.

What then is the Bible? First of all, it is not revelation. It is the record of God's revelation to men who met Him in the revelatory experience. The Bible is a human word pointing to a divine word which God speaks to man immediately, but that word is not really a word. For the Christians, it is definitively the Word of God made flesh. Without getting involved in the philosophic formulations of ultimate theory, Christian scriptural scholars like Charles Dodd, Oscar Cullman, G. Ernest Wright and H. H. Rowley consider the Bible as the record of revelation, not in the sense that the writers communicated their own experience in pointer fashion, but rather that they narrate God's mighty deeds in history for man's salvation. God reveals Himself in the deeds and not in words. In the deeds God is known and not in the words concerning those deeds. If for Tillich the Bible words are a pointer to God who can only be met in existentialist anxiety, for Charles Dodd and the others the words are pointers to the divine break-through into history on the level on which history is a matter of vital concern.

All too rapidly have we given the sketchy outline of theories concerning Bible and prophecy. The nuances, the limiting reservations and the reasons for the positions described have been left out of our skeletal presentation. They may be considered by some to be caricature, though since no judgment was intended, they should not be labeled as caricature, but only inadequate simplifications.

Now we must essay the task of evaluation. To do so, certain presuppositions must be stated. I take it that there is a Jewish tradition concerning the Bible and the prophets, though the tradition has many expressions, not all of which can be reduced to identity. But in the different traditions there is a common core which can be called the tradition simply. It is not possible to define accurately this tradition because the edges are not clear and sharp. What is true of the Jewish tradition is also true of the Christian traditions. There too there is a common core, which stands out best in Catholicism but is not absent in non-Catholic traditions.

Secondly a man who calls himself a Jew or a Catholic by that very fact professes acceptance of his tradition. When he thinks and speaks, he is bound by the tradition. If he does not like the tradition, he can make up his own scheme of God and life, but he must not label that scheme with the name of the tradition to which he does not inwardly want to belong. Of course, every intelligent supporter of a tradition wants to give the genuine tradition and he will in all good faith and for good reasons reject certain formulations of the tradition which he does not consider genuine. It is the love of the tradition which makes him act so and he is no traitor, though some of his colleagues will think he is. This is inevitable and only in this way does the tradition itself evolve and stay vital.

I do not dare to speak for the Hebrew tradition because I am not a Hebrew scholar. I do know something about the Catholic tradition and in its light I shall make my remarks, antecedently conceding that others may see the tradition differently.

Catholicism vs. fundamentalism

According to the principles of the Catholic tradition old fashioned fundamentalism or even its current refurbishing are untenable. The supposition of Catholicism is that the scriptures are not translucent to any one who reads them with good will. The Catholic believes

that in this way the reader will read into scripture his own unconscious and conscious presuppositions. Even if he be a first-class historian and philologist knowing all the history and languages needed for the task, he can only achieve a personal construction of the biblical message which has no guarantee of fidelity. Above all, if the book is considered to be more than an historical document and accepted as a divine communication, then resonance with the divine is needed. Historiographic competence is not identical with resonance with deity. There must be a different test for such resonance, and for the Catholic the test is congruity with the teaching of the living Church. Personally derived illumination from the scriptures must be tested by the holy community's judgment.

Likewise the literalism which is so characteristic of the fundamentalist offends Catholic sensitivity. God's ways are not man's ways and God's word cannot be spoken as man speaks. The biblical word has a dimension which is more than human, and it is precisely the superhuman dimension which makes the scriptures precious. By literalism the fundamentalists have exposed the scriptural message to ridicule with the result that God is unwittingly blasphemed by men. Blasphemy is a great sin, even though the speaker be unconscious of his blasphemy. The fundamentalist wants to derive cosmology, biology and historiographic reporting from the Bible, but this was not the divine intent of the books.

Just because fundamentalism cannot be accepted by the Catholic, neither can liberalism, for it is the same thing. The liberal approaches the Bible as if it were merely a human book and then he deals with it as he would deal with any human book. It is of course a human book and it is amenable to such treatment, but as the Catholic see its, it is also a superhuman book. Just because the liberal comes to the book with more scientific training and expertness is no sign that by his tools he can reach the superhuman dimension of the writings. In fact his tools by postulate cannot even touch that phase of the scriptural message and many a liberal exegete with full awareness has denied that there was a divine dimension. The Catholic on the other hand admits most willingly that the Bible is a human product and that it can be studied fruitfully by scientific method. In fact he urges the scholar to do so, for the more we know about the Bible in its human make-up,

the more we shall know about the divine content which is rooted in the human word. However, the Catholic also believes that there is yet another level to the Bible which cannot even be touched by the instruments of scientific philology. Here the Tradition alone is competent. Its doctrine will not be "scientific"; it will be an object of faith.

This brings us to the current theory of the Bible as salvational history. It is this theory which interests us most. Its appearance is witness to the fact that fundamentalism and liberalism are dead issues. The new view is more adapted to our times and needs. Hence we must look at it more closely.

The first feature which pleases believers in the thought of the theorists of salvational history is that there is a frank recognition that God did reveal Himself and the record of that revelation can be found in the Bible. Revelation is forthrightly affirmed. Secondly, belief in revelation is unembarrassed by fundamentalist prejudices. The anthropomorphisms of scripture are not taken literally nor is there any attempt to evade the fact that there are all sorts of inaccuracies in the scripture if it were to be considered as a scientifically reportorial account of historical events. The cosmological, biological and psychological ideas in the Bible are recognized for what they are: the world-image shared by all men of the ancient near East. Thirdly, the divine dimension of scripture is affirmed. The totality of the scholarly effort to understand the text is orientated toward the achievement of the divine action is history. These three qualities make the new scriptural approach very attractive to a generation which wants to believe but can stomach neither fundamentalism nor liberalism. Yet before we commit ourselves wholly to it, it might be wise to study some of the postulates of the new theory.

My first uneasiness comes from the affirmation that revelation is in the salvational events narrated in scripture, rather than in the words. This postulate is quite satisfactory in what it affirms but it is disconcerting in as far as it denies. That God reveals Himself in events is a constant element both in Jewish and Christian beliefs. However, it seems to me that both traditions also have constantly held that the words in their own way are revelational. Not event alone; not word alone; but word and event. Certainly the event

itself cannot be recognized as divine unless a divine word is spoken to make its superhuman reality knowable. As an event in history it will be presumed homogeneous with all other events in history. Only the word of God can make the event known as a divine deed.

Prophecy

It is at this point that the whole question of prophecy comes to the fore. The writer of the sacred books or at least the compiling editors were not prophets. They only gave us the message of the prophets. We have in the past been prone to consider the prophet as a predictor. Actually in the Bible itself this notion though definitely present is yet quite subordinate. In Exodus we seem to have the authentic meaning of the Hebrew *nabhi*. In chapter 4 Moses objects to his election as the man to free Israel from bondage on the grounds that he cannot speak eloquently. The Name tells Moses that Aaron will be the prophet of Moses and Moses will act as God for Aaron. Aaron was to be the mouth of Moses and Moses was to put God's words into the mouth of Aaron. In chapter 7 (v. 1–2) the Name once more gives the same message: Moses was to be God to Pharaoh and Aaron, and Aaron would be the mouth of Moses, his prophet.

From this locus, as well as from many others, we gather that the *nabhi* was the human mouth of God, whereby God spoke to the people. Prediction is not here mentioned at all. However, in Deuteronomy norms are given for distinguishing the false prophet from the true one. The basic notion of the *nabhi* is again brought out:

The Lord said to me, "They have spoken aright; from time to time I will raise up from them someone like you from among their fellow-countrymen to be a prophet: I will put my oracles in his mouth, and he shall tell them everything that I command him. If there is anyone who will not heed the oracle that he delivers in my name, I shall make him answer for it myself.

(18:17–19)

After the expression of the prime meaning of *nabhi*, the locus gives the norm for knowing whether or not the prophet is authentic:

And if you say to yourself, "How are we to recognize an oracle

that the Lord has not given?"—if the oracle that the prophet delivers in the name of the Lord does not come to pass or come true, that is an oracle which the Lord did not give, the prophet having spoken it presumptuously; you are not to be afraid of him.

(18:21–22)

In the light of these very important passages we are led to doubt the total accuracy of the modern slogan: prophets are forth-speakers but not foretellers. As the Hebrew sacred writers saw it, the prophet was a speaker-for and this at times involved foretelling. The speaking-forth was in function of the speaking-for and the foretelling.

There seems to be some ground in scripture that the divine revelation comes from God speaking to the prophet not merely in the mightly deeds of God himself witnessed by the prophet with insight. Perhaps the last words of the Pentateuch bring out the relations of the two things:

Since then no prophet has appeared in Israel like Moses, with whom the Lord held converse face to face—as regards all the signs and portents which the Lord sent him to perform in the land of Egypt against Pharaoh and all his courtiers and all his land, as well as all the mighty power and all the great wonders which Moses performed in the sight of the Lord.

(Dt 34:10–12)

In this eulogy of Moses much is made of the mighty deeds God worked through him, but the first claim to praise was that he conversed with God face to face.

In all of the passages alluded to, we meet with anthropomorphisms. Here we must say something of symbol, myth and logical predication. If I say that a stone is hard, hardness is predicated logically. There is a reference to an empirical quality which can be measured objectively. In older logical terminology, hard stones and hard timbers were instances of what was called the univocal use of hard.

However when I say Peter's heart is hard, the attribute is not used univocally with hard stones. Actually we are dealing with a mythical expression according to which the human heart is in popular image, though not in physical reality, the synthesis of human emotion and feeling. Between the stubborn unfeelingness

of Peter and the hardness of a rock there is a superficial and extrinsic analogy. Hard is predicated analogously, not logically.

Lastly when I say that God is master of the universe, I am borrowing a term normally used for a human being who is the master of his house. It is my intention to affirm the mastership of God, but I do not intend to say that God and man are masters in the same way. God's mastership is real mastership but in a way which makes it altogether different from human mastership, and yet the same. All which limits the mastership of a man is dropped out in my affirmation of divine mastership. I affirm all that which is positive but deny everything which is limiting. If I were to subject the proposition to logical analysis it would come out like this: the proportion of master to man is equivalently the proportion of master to God. I do not say that the proportion is identical, but I affirm its equivalence. This mode of predication was called by the Scholastics intrinsic analogy. It is not like the analogy of a myth, which is always extrinsic, but it is an analogy in the use of the word *to be*. I do not say God's mastership is like man's mastership but that it is equivalently human mastership.

Hence we see that in affirmation three forms are possible. The word *is* can be understood as simple identity: the stone is hard. It can also mean extrinsic similarity: Peter in his unfeelingness is like a hard stone. It can mean intrinsic equivalence: God is the matter of the universe.

We are accustomed today to the opposition of literal to symbolic and mythical. Yet such opposition is misleading. The proposition in its literal structure may be logical, extrinsically analogical, or intrinsically analogical. The literal meaning is only the meaning intended on the *litterae*, the material signs of a mental intention.

But the fundamental truth recognized in the opposition of literal to symbolic is valid. Not all propositions are to be taken as if they were logical statements. They can easily be analogical. What is more, when we speak of God we can only speak analogically. Human words coined for run of the mill human experiences and God is no such an experience. When we use words about Him, we are affirming them according to His reality and not ours. There is an equivalence between God's reality and a creature's reality. Yet God's reality, though quite like my reality, is altogether different.

Myth, revelation, and inspiration

In Plato's Republic there is a double tirade against the poets because they used images in order to convey insights. How far Plato believed in his tirades and how far he had his tongue in his cheek, is not so clear. He certainly does not disdain the use of quotations from the poets to make his own points. The fact of the matter is that all mankind has seen in the poets a superlative capacity for communicating profound truth, though if subjected to logical analysis their propositions are nonsense. They do it mythically rather than logically. By myth I only mean that they speak in terms of analogies. The poet more than the sober reporter is interested in deep truth. The reporter more than the poet is interested in phenomenology. Both types of writing are good and each has an area where it is better than the other. I would not like my physician to write his prescriptions in poetry, just as I would not like a reporter to describe the mere physical event in which I grasped a great truth. Newton's grasp of the law of attraction was not a logical continuation of the physical fall of the apple on his head. In fact, the Newton myth shows what the poet can do. From all accounts, Newton achieved the insight into gravity without the aid of a falling apple. The apple story is a myth but a revealing one. The apple in paradise and Newton's apple were of the same kind. It is just as silly to look for Newton's apple tree in the orchards of England as it is to look for the tree of the knowledge of good and evil in Mesopotamia. Such action is like the child's search for the pot of gold at the end of the rainbow. But Newton's apple and Eve's apple poetically refer to an historical event.

At this point we must distinguish between revelation and inspiration. The prophet had revelation, if we are to take the scriptures seriously. This means that he experienced God in a moment of divine unveiling. That experience was graciously effected by the Deity and the meeting of God and man can be expressed meaningfully in the analogy that God and man held converse. Such experience is obviously mysterious. It is so different from the ordinary experiences of ordinary man that it cannot be reduced to the modes of ordinary perception. In the experience truth was conveyed, and when this truth is communicated to man, the prophet has only the intrinsically and extrinsically analogical use of language as his medium of expression.

After the prophet comes a writer or compiler, who could, but need not be the prophet himself. This man did not have revelation but composed for a reading public the revelational message. He may have used much of the language of the original prophet or little. He may not have known the prophet and used only oral traditions and fragmentary writings as the source of his work. As a literary workman, the writer constructed the prophetic message according to the modes of literary structuring accepted in his time and against the background of the world-image operating in his society.

Was this work of the literary intermediary a sheerly human undertaking? When Plato gives us the doctrine of Socrates was he doing the same thing which the authors of sacred books did? If the situation is an exact parallel, then we run into serious difficulties. Today there is much controversy as to the significance of Socrates in the Platonic dialogues. No one believes that the dialogues were held as they are written by Plato, but some think that Socrates had all the basic ideas attributed to him by Plato, while others think that Socrates was an insignificant man who serves Plato as an almost mythical figure for getting off Plato's own ideas. In biblical science we have something of the same kind. Did the Deuteronomist build up his own ethics and theology and hang it on to the name of Moses, or was he really faithful to Mosaic prophecy?

If we rely exclusively on philological method, we shall not be able to answer these questions with anything like ultimate satisfaction. Actually what happened in the case of Socrates and Plato leaves me cold. The Socrates created or re-created by Plato is very winsome and his ideas very illuminating. However, in the question of the Deuteronomist and Moses I am concerned. Is the Deuteronomist giving me God's message as spoken to Moses or is he spinning it out of his own head? I owe no commitment to the Deuteronomist, but I do owe submission to God.

In the Catholic Church the problem is solved prophetically. She claims to know by apostolic revelation that the biblical books accurately and without error give the burden of the original prophets' message. The inerrancy of the writer is explained by divine inspiration. The writer himself may never have had any revelatory experience but he is moved consciously or unconsciously by God to write

down the prophet's revelation so that the divine communication be expressed intact. This is divine inspiration and it is supernatural. In man it is an intellectual impulse to write. God makes a man write His message, and the written word, composed by a man, is by intrinsic analogy the word of God. A mechanical reproduction of the oracles of the original prophet is not implied, nor is that important seeing that the prophet himself communicated according to the conventions, philosophy and rhetoric of his own time. These external human things are not the substance of the revelation which can be clad in other human garb just as conveniently.

Consequences

The consequence of this theory of inspiration makes the words of the Bible, and not only the mighty deeds of God there narrated, revelation. The prophet had the revelation immediately and the reader of the prophet's message mediated through an inspired writer has is mediately. The result is that the holy community, in addition to its own efforts at communication, has a divine instrument whereby to communicate God's revelation. The holy community by reason of prophetic guidance initially given and by the enlightening of the indwelling Spirit knows the divine dimension of the biblical accounts. This dimension she points to, stresses and explains. The reader of the Bible who reads it in the arms of the holy community meets the revealing God and surrenders himself to the revealer in faith.

Unless we form some such theory of revelation and of inspiration, I fear that we shall lose the Bible. It will always be an ancient book and a classic in literature but its religious significance is lost. If the words of the Bible are not truly God's word, it is hard to see why we should revere it so highly. Just because it is archaic lends it no sanctity. If I do not achieve God's revelation in the biblical word but only the revelational event, nine tenths of the Bible can be ignored. It seems to me that in loyalty to our respective traditions we must cling to the traditional image of prophecy and inspiration, or simply confess that we cannot belong to the tradition. If this latter be our conclusion, then let us candidly state that we do not belong to the community which claims to be true to its tradition.

LETTERS TO SR. JEREMY

Gus Weigel hated writing letters. In his later years he even went to the length of having the following form printed on a post card: "Since letter-writing is a very difficult business for me, I am taking the liberty of giving you a prompt reply to the substance of your request in this somewhat uncouth form."

The demands of public fame had grown to the point that he was forced to utilize several scholastics at Woodstock as secretaries. Letters came to him from all over the world and from all types of people—from Cardinals, theologians, fellow Jesuits, ministers, businessmen, housewives, Chilean friends, former students. A beatnik in New York wrote to tell him that he had heard him over a local television station and that Gus had really turned him on. During the middle fifties he began a correspondence with Paul Tillich, after the latter had been so favorably impressed with Gus's interpretation of his work.

Quite naturally, Gus was at his best in informal letters, where his compelling candor and pointed humor could have free play. Especially revealing of the man are his letters to his niece, Mary Louise Daigler, before and after 1958, when she became a Religious Sister of Mercy.

October 27, 1952

My dear Mary Louise,

Please accept my hearty congratulations on your admission to the National Honor Society. . . . During these times I have been thinking of your college days. It is only a question of two years from now when we shall have to settle that matter. Let me insist again on trying for the New York State Regents' Scholarship. Please look into this matter and see what is required to be eligible for the scholarships. . . .

Your letters are very nicely written and I enjoy them very much. There is a maturity about them that is consoling. However, when I say this, I do not want you to think that every letter you write to me is a kind of examination. Write in all spontaneity, because a letter that you do not want to write usually is only a torture, while a letter that you really want to write is a relief. . . .

This letter sounds a bit stilted. That is unavoidable. We do not know each other as well as we should. You like me but you are afraid of me. I like you very much but I do not dare to push myself into your affairs, which interest me greatly. Well, some day we shall talk with our hair down. There is no hurry, and if it never comes, then that is a good sign too, because it means that you have no great troubles. I feel sure that if you were to have such troubles, you would discuss them with me.

I have not been feeling too well in the last months—a situation quite new to me. There is nothing serious and I hope that I shall soon be out of the woods. With every best wish—

Your Uncle,

February 7, 1954

My dear Mary Louise,

You certainly are a determined young lass. Do you think you will break me of my habit of *not* writing letters? Such seems to be your proposal. I give in a bit because you are you, but I shall not give in all together. For years I wrote to your mother so rarely that she never knew if I was alive or dead. The new generation seems to be more demanding. Well, youth will have its way.

I enclose your French letter. It might be better and it might be worse. I do not demand too much because you are new at this French game—but I like the French and Latin tags in your letters. They give promise. . . .

If you get one answer to every three of your letters, your batting average can be considered high. Please tell me something precise about your coming to Baltimore at Easter time. I have to know in order to keep my own schedule open.

Sincerely yours,

December 4, 1954

Dear Mary Louise,

You will be the death of me! How can you expect a man who is rapidly getting old to change all his ways of life? You can't teach an old dog new tricks. I am writing to you, but please keep up your old belief that I do not write. In that way, you will not be disappointed.

I am so glad that you and Bob had a lovely evening at that Canisius pandemonium. I am just as glad that he has invited you again. Now, a word of warning. You and he have long years of study ahead of you. For heaven's sake, don't fall in love with him. If you are very young, and you are, the first time is hardly ever the real time, and to love and then have the thing blow up in your face is a very painful experience. Having a cancer removed is nothing in comparison with jilted love. Take it easy, big girl. . . .

There is little I have to tell you. You are quite right when you say that I send you books because it frees me from writing a letter, and yet it shows you that I am thinking of you always. Your little sophisticated picture is very good, and it fits the sophisticated person which you are. Quite impressive! I think I told you that I like the get-up of your last issue. I read the things written by you—but the rest I skip. I cannot get excited about the activities of Helitrope Funfunelli. . . .

Sister Thecla always asks for you. I always tell her that, thanks be to God, you have been quite sober lately. That pleases her because it distresses her to think of you as dead drunk on a barroom floor. . . .

At Christmas time I shall interrogate you closely concerning this Bob. Ryan is his name, isn't it? How dreadfully Irish.

Your uncle,

March 25th, 1955

My dear Mary Louise,

Please allow me to repeat my congratulations to you in a formal way. I am very happy that all our dreams are coming true. You

will be very welcome in Baltimore and the Otenaseks take it quite for granted that you will make their house your own. . . .

You know that I wanted you out of Buffalo. If you go to College there, you will have all the smugness so typical of our city. . . . [Mount St. Agnes] is a college for a small group, which has the advantage of close contact of students with their professors. The spirit of the school is progressive and the professors are able people. Here you will grow. The social life within the school will not be too intense but you will have the advantages of Baltimore which is a city of traditions—not too progressive but of good taste. Likewise I shall be sufficiently near to you so that I can take care of emergencies and needs. Let me impress on you now that I want you to call on me when something turns up which you cannot handle. From time to time you will need a few dollars which you cannot scrape up by yourself; then you must gladly and without embarrassment turn to your Uncle. . . .

The Baltimore girls will give you a bit of trouble in the beginning. They are inclined to be sophisticated and superior. This is only skin-deep. Your school is middle-class. Very few of them are wealthy, though not a few come from comfortably fixed families. By and large the girls will come from the same kind of background you come from, even though it may seem otherwise. The Jesuits have always described Baltimore as "fur coats but no underwear." You will learn all that little by little. . . .

Little girl, you are a little girl no longer. This is the first step in life—quasi-adult life. It should be very happy, for, as I said, college days are the happiest days. So be not afraid. You will do very well, let me assure you. Come with a big heart and courage. There will be difficulties to overcome, but you have friends in Baltimore who will help you in any way that they can. . . .

It is almost a year ago that we were together in Baltimore and Washington. It is consequently almost a year ago that I was sick. I did not die. Perhaps God saved me so that you can get the kind of education you need. Let us look at it that way. It will help us to be grateful to God.

Sincerely yours,

April 30, 1958

Sr. M. Jeremy, N.R.S.M.
Mount Saint Agnes College
Baltimore, Maryland

Dear Jeremy,

Listening to the Martyrology at dinner tonight I discovered that tomorrow is the birthday of the Prophet Jeremiah, your patron saint in religion. It needs a little note to you, and this is the note. I shall remember you especially at the Altar tomorrow.

Your letter came and brought me pleasure. There was a sophisticated tone to it which one does not expect from novices. That made it all the more thrilling. You are maturing beautifully and I hope that the process will continue to full ripeness.

Strange; your birthday is on the last day of May and your name day is on the first day of May. There must be some meaning in this —but I do not know what it is.

Your uncle,

May 30, 1960

Sr. M. Jeremy, R.S.M.

My dear Mary Louise:

This little note is written to wish you a happy birthday. There will be no need to make the message long because I shall see you next Sunday, your graduation day. Every time you graduate from a school, you do so with a scholarship for another school in your hand. This is a good habit and I hope you cling to it. After Ph.D., there is always a Fulbright grant. (You can go to Rome or Greece on one of those things, even though the Sisters of Mercy have no convents there.) . . .

Tomorrow my mass will be for you.

Sincerely yours,

April 29, 1961

My dear Mary Louise,

On May first you celebrate Jeremy's day. I want to congratulate you and be merry with you. In fact it will be merry Jerry's day.

Life for me is a matter of going here, there and yonder. I suppose that I shall have to break a leg. At this time of the year I always think of our visit together to Washington. It was seven years ago. So much has happened since, both to you and to me.

Which makes me conclude by greeting with one of John Murray's slogans: Courage, it's better than intelligence.

Perhaps one of these days I'll pop in on you.

Your devoted Uncle,

May 29, 1961

My dear Mary Louise:

This is my birthday greeting. I wish you many happy returns and I shall remember you at the Altar.

The fact that you are not to get the M.A. does not disturb me at all. In fact, I am glad. I never believe in M.A.'s. They are either consolation prizes or worse. However, I know that this whole experience is very painful to you. It should not be, but I am certain that the ought of the case and the actuality of it are quite different. We have not lost faith in you and you must not either. . . .

Devoted as ever,

Your Uncle,

May 29, 1963

Sr. M. Jeremy, R.S.M.
Mercy High School
Baltimore, Maryland

Dear Sr. Jeremy,

This note—for we cannot call it a letter—brings you my greetings for your birthday. I hope it will be happy and that it have many others in its train. I shall remember you to the Lord at the holy Altar.

I do not write frequently nor do I see you much. Neither action is necessary. You know that my affection for you is great and I count on your loyalty for me. This is enough. More would be superfluous. Yet I hope that the near future will give me the opportunity to see you.

Life for me is hectically active—too much so to permit me to enjoy my work. But I survive and that is a big victory in itself. I hope you are a little less pushed. At all events, all blessings on you.

Your Uncle,

Gustave Weigel, S.J.

VATICAN COUNCIL

Vatican II was the final stage for Gustave Weigel's deeply dimensioned life as missionary, scholar, ecumenist, and priest. It was fitting that his last engagement should have been an ecumenical council, where all these dimensions could be brought to common fulfilment.

Two years before John XXIII opened the Council in October, 1962, Fr. Weigel was already in Rome preparing the schema for the first session as a consultant to the Secretariate for Promoting Christian Unity. During the sessions themselves, besides continuing his work on the Secretariate, he served as host to the Protestant, Anglican, and Orthodox observer-delegates. Daily he sat with them at the sessions in St. Peter's Basilica, translating from Latin when necessary and commenting on the action transpiring on the floor of the basilica. At night he retired to the same lodgings shared by many of the delegates, to brief them on the next day's matters, listen to their suggestions, and make himself constantly available on the informal basis in which he thrived.

When secrecy was partially lifted during the second session, daily press briefings were held. Gus as a member of the American Bishops press panel quickly became the favorite of the English speaking press with his sardonic wit and encyclopedic knowledge. Seemingly asleep under the hot Italian afternoon, he would continually startle journalists into laughter with his rapier-like comments and masterly timing. One reporter compared him to a sea turtle snapping at flies. The press loved it.

Amid the trying meetings of the first session, when it was not yet clear whether the conservatives or liberals would dominate the Council, Fr. Weigel kept a diary of the Council's agonizing beginnings. Excerpts, carefully and unfortunately edited, appear below. He discontinued the diary for the second session, but several letters to Jesuits at Woodstock do survive. In the last one he wrote, in November, 1963, he reassured them that his health was good. Less than two months later he was dead.

Diary

OCT. 11, THURS., 8:30 A.M.

1st Public Session. Ceremony. Papal. Started late, of course—about 9:15. Procession of Cardinals and Bishops, (White mitres) impressive—a sea of white in the ascending stands in the middle nave—about 2540 present. To Westside of Baldochino, council altar erected. Pope's throne set at main altar on west side.

OCT. 13, SATURDAY, 9 A.M.

Mass of H[oly] G[host] said & gospel enthroned, meeting opened with Card. Liénart taking the floor to ask of presidency postponement of election of members of commissions in order to study catalogues & letting different episcopal conferences discuss & recommend. Immediately Card. Frings arose and spoke in his name and those of König & Doepfner in the same vein. Presidency postponed elections to 2d General Congregation & asked episcopal conferences to submit lists to Secretariate of Council.

Behind this action lies a refusal to be swept into election which would favor . . . instructed group. The Council began with an act of resistance. Following the session, the Germans & French got very busy & worked in accord, forming with Holland, Benelux, Austria, Hung[ary] a complete list for all posts open. The Italians also met but showed a split. Their list did not include all posts but only some. Lat[in] Americans caucused. So did Africa-Asia. . . .

OCT. 22, MONDAY, 9:00 A.M.

4th General Congregation. (1st on Liturgy). Usual beginning. Lorenz Jaegher said the Mass. Felici announced elected to remaining 3 commissions. German triumph. . . . About 20 spoke. Most for schema. Only 4 against. Spellman spoke: against real reform and against vernacular: Vagnozzi called schema bad theology and wanted no real reform; Dante (Cong. Rit.) wanted no change. These were *extra Chorum;* vernacular desired by vast majority. One bish[op] sardonically criticized phony relics. . . . There is no doubt but that the progressives are leading in utterance and number. This means the traditionalists will begin playing dirty pool.

OCT. 23, TUESDAY, 9:00 A.M.

5th. General Congregation (2d on Liturgy). . . . About 20 spoke on the proemium & individual decrees. Ottaviani said what Vagnozzi said yesterday. He wants a theological revision, i.e. he does not like its theology. He claims it's ambiguous, when not down right wrong. Ritter spoke, & said his mind was shared by many American bishops . . . He favored vernacular in the didactic mass. McIntyre made a passionate speech in Latin . . . for the retention of Latin. No change! "Stability of faith endangered if Latin dropped." Ruffini the same but more gentle and genteel. Yet the majority wanted Latin either dropped altogether or in part. Patri.[arch] Maximos IV Saigh in French ridiculed any primacy for Latin. "Paul's advice that our words be intelligible is directed to us." . . .

OCT. 26, FRIDAY, 9:00 A.M.

7th General Congregation. (4th on Liturgy). Mass said by a black African bishop. Everything as usual. Frings presided. About 30 spokesmen. Still on Proemium & 1st chap. of Liturgy.

The Council has bogged down. The talk is incessant but nothing substantial is in it. It is very weary to listen to Bishops, most of whom make some picayune point. Latin is still the issue but a compromise is seen—some vernacular but Latin mainly.

Tonight the Comm[ission] of Extraordinary Affairs is meeting to see if a way can be found to get going. At present rate, more than a week on 1 chapter of hundreds, we'll be here for years.

OCT. 30, TUESDAY, 9:00 A.M.

10th General Congregation (7th on Liturgy). Formalities as usual. Alfrieb[?] presided. Gracias spoke movingly about the Indian crisis, indicating Ind[ian] bishops may have to return. [This was precipitated by the border dispute with Communist China.] Asked prayers. (Final Angelus said for India.)

Much talk. About 20. Principal subjects: two species communion & concelebration. McQuade of Dublin in name of Irish hierarchy, against both, Ottaviani against, & spoke 15 minutes & then silenced by presidency [Ruffini] which action was clapped heartily by the Fathers. . . .

The main problem is that the present procedure bogs down the works. Secret commissions are working. . . .

NOV. 6, TUESDAY, 9:00 A.M.

13th General Congregation (10th on Liturgy). An important meeting. After a Latin Mass, Felici & five translations announced the papal order empowering the presidency, having judged that the question has been sufficiently illumined, to introduce the vote for cloture, given by standing or hand-raising. The presidency promptly invoked cloture and it was then voted unanimously by standing. Chap[ter] 3 was then open for discussion—on Sacraments & Sacramentals. The desire for vernacular & local adaptations is overpowering. About 20 spoke.

Felici then announced papal termination of first session on Dec. 8th with a papal mass. No date announced for reopening.

NOV. 16, FRIDAY, 9:00 A.M.

20th General Congregation (2nd on fonts). . . . Fight between rejection of schema and retention went on. McIntyre spoke *for retention*, and complained of scripture scholars. About 20 spoke. . . . Italians all for retention—their main spokesman was Florit of Florence—a well-minded conservative, who can use two or three words in German, which is supposed to show scholarship. Spaniards play a middle of road game; they admit schema is defective, but they all consider it a good enough base to argue from. Dangerous position, because changes will be of the text and its tone & orientation are bad & cannot be changed by verbal corrections. It must be reformed altogether. French, German, Dutch all for rejection. No unity of Americans. Africans for rejection.

NOV. 19, MONDAY, 9:00 A.M.

22 General Cong. (4th on Font[s] Rev[elation]). Emile De Smedt of Bruges spoke in the name of our secretariate—against the schema as un-ecumenical. It was the most eloquent address of the Council so far. Told how Theological Commission would not accept Secretariates schema on Ecumenism. For first time I went to Bar Rabas; met Chilean Bishops. Everybody anxious for Cloture. The dilemma is that neither right or left can get 2 thirds. The Left wants this schema killed; the Right will kill any other. . . .

NOV. 21, WEDNESDAY, 9:00 A.M.

24th General Congregation (6th on Fonts Rev). Ukrainian Pontifical Mass. Ended 9:55. Ruffini presided. The Pope came through. Felici announced that the present schema will be reworked by a mixed commission—Theological & Unity Secretariate. No discussion of schema on Fonts after today. (They have no speakers on new theme, so with no usefulness about 20 spoke on 1st chap. of Fonts Schema.)

At the next meeting, Friday, we begin the Schema of Means of Social Communication. Safe. No one really interested.

There is a strong, widespread, desire to go home.

Finished at 12:00 noon.

Ottaviani & the Italo-Hispanic bloc lost the Council today.

NOV. 24, SATURDAY, 9:00 A.M.

26th General Congregation (2d on communicat[ions]. . . . All morning talk on communications. One father . . . insisted on our service rather than our right. The scheme is so concerned with Church's right to the Radio, Television, Press. Since this right is not recognized by half the human race, this kind of talk is unrealistic. . . .

Only 9 days to go. Thanks be to God!

NOV. 30, FRIDAY, 9:00 A.M.

30th General Congregation (4th de Unitate). . . . Pope is sick but no reliable information. Some say a prostate operation is necessary. Others say it is a cold. One rumor says he had a hemorrhage today.

DEC. 4, TUESDAY, 9:00 A.M.

33rd General Congregation, (3rd on Eccl.). . . . The talk went on. . . . Less than half for. The schema's many shortcomings pointed out in countless ways. The only true defenders are the Italians.

The mixed commission is being dominated by Ottaviani, Ruffini & Parente. Our Sec. people not talking. . . .

Everyone tired and anxious to go. The council sessions boring & too many outside meetings to labor on afterwards.

Pope's condition still unknown. Rumors vary from cold to prostatitis to cancerous growth . . .—but there is no reliable information. . . .

DEC. 8, SATURDAY, 10:00 A.M.

Second Public Session. Before the Mass Observers went to Cicognani's office in Secretariate of State. 9:15 A.M. Gave a little English talk in name of Pope. Lukas Vischer answered in French.

Paolo Marcella sang Mass of Immac[ulate] Conception. (Gregorian chant. Benedictine choir leading) Started at 10:00 A.M. promptly. Outsiders were present: diplomats, 3 princes et al. Pope came in at 11:00 & read a 15 minute platitude. All of us out before 12:00. It is over!

Letters to Woodstock

Rome, October, 15, 1963

Dear Father Rector:

This letter brings you and the Faculty Fathers my infrequent report from Rome. . . .

The Council is moving very slowly. The discussion from the first Congregation to the moment has been dealing with de Ecclesia. Nothing startling has been said and the excitement of the First Session is missing. If the rhythm of the moment follows on, this Council will be longer than the Council of Trent. The Pope makes no interference. The Open Door School is in the ascendency but there is a mood of compromise.

The voting has been on the Liturgy. The chapter on the Mass has been accepted juxta *modum.* This will delay the definitive formula. The problem seems to be how much vernacular will be allowed. The question of concelebration causes minor difficulties and this is also true of communion under both kinds (which in the original scheme is a rare event.)

The collegiality of the Bishops meets with the opposition of the Mediterraneans. They are ultra Papalists. We are far from voting on this point.

The Theological Commission is following the tactic of doing nothing. This will delay all action. Maybe that is what they want. . . .

The best joke: The Italians have a new division of Christians. The Italians are "we Catholics." The Protestants are the Separated Brethren. The non-Italian Catholics are the United Brethren.

I think of Woodstock often. Remember me in your prayers.

Sincerely yours,
Gustave Weigel, S.J.

November 11, 1963

Very Reverend Michael Maher, S.J.:

This is my second and last report to you from the Council. At the moment we can see the end and I expect to be in Woodstock immediately after the last congregation here. . . .

This time the newspapers are well informed of what is going on. Consequently you will know the news. The less visible of what is going on is important. The opened and closed parties are numerically indecisive. The open door advocates are in the majority but the minority is not small. Hence there is no clear victory for the Open Door. There is much tension and the Closed Door is far from giving in.

On the whole, the work done favors many changes. The episcopal nature of government is definitely decided. The question is to what degree this is true. It is hard to say much now.

It seems most probable that Ecumenism will be treated before this session is finished. But one cannot be sure even of that. This scheme includes a statement on Church and State under a less provocative title: Religious Liberty. This was done by Bishop de Smedt and P. Jerome Hamer, O.P. John Murray took on the ungrateful job of putting source foot-notes to the document. . . .

My health is good—but I am homesick for Woodstock.

Sincerely yours,
Gustave Weigel, S.J.

MAN FOR OTHERS: REFLECTIONS ON GUSTAVE WEIGEL

Walter J. Burghardt, S.J.

More than a decade ago, while playing the hypochondriac with uncommon conviction, I burst into Gus Weigel's room at Woodstock and announced triumphantly: "Gus, I told you so. There *is* something wrong. They've discovered a single diverticulum and a small diaphragmatic hernia." He looked up from his book, not unsympathetic but singularly unimpressed: "All right. Now you have a peg on which to hang your neurosis."

I revive this embarrassing reminiscence because it concretizes what in my experience was Gustave Weigel's dominant quality: he was refreshingly realistic. Oh yes, he could dramatize a situation, dress up an idea, ham a favorite insight, get gloriously entangled in Weigelian rhetoric. It may even be, as some claimed, that his conception of the Church was unrealistically Platonic, an ideal reality in some sense distinguishable from the living, sinful people of God. But in the main his life style was splendidly real, and the realism was quite pervasive.

Gus was realistic in his approach to persons. Thousands touched his life; yet there was nothing so important that he would not turn it off for any one of them. The principle? If a person was "there," why, there he was—and there was Gus. For fifteen years his Woodstock room was open to any member of the community, day or night. His time was yours, anywhere, whoever you were: Protestant observer in St. Peter's or Jewish newsboy at Gwynn Oak Junction; ambassador to Chile or colored cook in Woodstock's kitchen; bishop of Salt Lake City or teen-age daughter of a local friend; retired general in Florida or novice at Mount Saint Agnes. His life was a constant reproach to justifiable selfishness.

In line with this feeling for the person, Gus was realistic about human weakness. And sympathetic, in his strong fashion. Especially, perhaps, where "sins of the flesh" were concerned. Particu-

larly with adolescents. Some might have thought him a laxist in moral theology; I don't believe he was. He simply did not place any great emphasis on an individual action, on certain "growing pains," on regulations that obstructed or crippled, on universal principles isolated from flesh and blood. I suspect he would have found much in contemporary situation ethics to his liking. Not everything; for his individualism was deeply rooted in the Catholic community, in a dynamizing tradition.

Gus was realistic about his own person, his own gifts. They were many and varied: philosophical penetration, linguistic facility, leechlike memory, rhetorical artistry, a peasant energy, wisdom in counseling, psychological balance, feeling for foreign cultures, openness to new experiences, critical acumen, gusty humor—all so nicely harmonized for maximum productivity that I sometimes felt dreadfully inferior in the face of it. But still more impressive was his refusal to be particularly impressed by his gifts. They were just that, "gifts," God's gracious giving; and he tried with fair success not to get in God's way. He would have agreed with Martin D'Arcy's touching remark at the recent Club 21 celebration of his eightieth birthday: "Anything I've been able to accomplish has really been God's doing. If he weren't there, you know, the things I've done would all be quite silly."

Gus was realistic about theology. He saw clearly that the theologian's service to the Church, to man, is not so much the search for certainty as the quest for understanding—a point mightily stressed by his friend and colleague John Courtney Murray. He insisted that the one thing not permitted any generation "is the employment of categories which carry no excitement for those who hear the proclamation of the Gospel." Even his inflammatory reference to Catholic theological seminaries as mostly "barber colleges" was not uninformed or uninspired. And ever the realist, he could understand a student not doing *theology* during his four years at Woodstock; he could not tolerate his doing *nothing*.

Weigel was a realist in the quest for religious unity. An ecumenist before ecumenism was a Catholic concern, he always saw compromise as theologically unacceptable, soon recognized conversion as factually unforeseeable, and concentrated on convergence, in belief and worship, as most in harmony with the way the wind

was blowing and the Spirit was listing. He commended himself (and Catholicism) to Protestants like Robert McAfee Brown, to Orthodox like Alexander Schmemann, and to Jews like Abraham Joshua Heschel by his openness, his frankness, his intelligence, his sympathy, his strong love—even his annoyed refusal to discuss anyone's sincerity: "Everybody's sincere."

Gus was realistic about his ecclesiology. I was convinced for quite some years that he should have been writing *the* ecclesiology for our time—scholarly, ecumenical, at once historical and existential—instead of traipsing off to the boondocks for a sodality lecture. Events have proved him right. A fresh ecclesiology would have been a mistake in 1960: the time was not yet ripe; it would have been ephemeral; all that came with such startling suddenness in Vatican II was still burgeoning. He could not have brought it off; no one could have then. It is even questionable whether Hans Küng has brought it off now, for all the learning, acumen, and insights of his recent volume on the Church.

Gus was a realist about death, about his death. He was not afraid to die. Not that he yearned for it "as the hart pants after the fountains of water"; Gus did not do much panting. It was simply that death was a fact of life, a Christian reality, a significant stage on the way to God. There it was, and so he faced it. One day it would come; but in contrast to most of us, he did not greatly care whether it came tomorrow or at the eschaton. And still I am perplexed by that near-fatal cancer. In 1954 he was as close to death as any man has a right to be and still live, when John Murray reportedly arrested the downward plunge with his famous "Gus, if you die on me now, I'll never speak to you again." It was the strangest of his unexplained experiences. As Murray said later, "He did not intend to live." It was as though he resented his cancer and his helplessness as "an aggression and an injury."

After that struggle with death, Gus Weigel was like a man in a hurry. There was so much to be done, and so few years. "He had a sense," Murray noted, "of living on borrowed time." Never did he refuse an invitation to speak, if it could somehow be squeezed into his schedule. His two-month lecture tour of Chile and Colombia in 1956 is exhausting even to read. During this decade his classes suffered increasingly—and he knew it. There was a principle

operative here: his conviction that, if he *could* do what he was asked to do, this was God's way of letting him know that he *should*. I disputed his principle, but as we look back now on his life and its influence, he may well have been right.

It is difficult to categorize Gus Weigel's realism, but he seemed more of an eschatologist than an incarnationalist. He put small stock in what man can achieve. He rather saw God accomplishing his purpose on his own good time—as with the unity of the churches. He took great delight in Thomas Carlyle's remark on Lady Margaret Fuller's dictum that she accepted the universe: "Gad! She'd better." And yet he was not a fatalist or a quietist. You do not accept the universe, he insisted, if you do not accept it as dynamic, in evolution; if you do not move with it, help it to move; if you do not blend necessity with freedom, in a humility that recognizes limitation without being crushed by it. He had high regard for intellect ("The intellectual life is the most important element in any society"), but he was extraordinarily aware of its finiteness.

Gustave Weigel was a man who loved—not obviously, not with heart on sleeve, but deep within and with deeds. His life and his love were "ec-centric," centered on others. I have rarely met anyone who gave so little thought to his own comfort, his own convenience, his own rights, his own preferences, his own pain. How sum him up? Perhaps in the Bonhoeffer summation of Jesus: a "man for others." Carl Henry, editor of the fundamentalist fortnightly *Christianity Today*, recaptured Gus uncommonly well when he wrote several weeks after his dear friend's death:

Father Weigel and this writer attended major ecumenical assemblies and conferences in the role of observer. But one meeting with him stands out, a simple luncheon in a modest Washington restaurant. We had spoken frankly of our own religious pilgrimages and had exchanged theological agreements and differences. Then suddenly, at a point of important dogmatic difference, Dr. Weigel reached a hand across the table and clasped mine. Calling me by name, he said, "I love you." The editor of Christianity Today *has met scores of Protestant theologians and philosophers of many points of view. None ever demonstrated as effectively as Gustave Weigel that the pursuit of truth must never be disengaged from the practice of love.*

INDEX TO VOLUME 97

Address at Bellarmine College. James Brodrick 57

Archbishop Hughes and the Jesuits. Francis X. Curran 5

Calcutta, Cassocks, and Cheroots. Charles P. Costello 80

Church and State. Gustave Weigel 540

Concept of Authority, The. William Meissner 252

Council of Scholastics of the Buffalo Province, The. Robert D. Coursey and William T. Ivory 117

Early Years, The. Gustave Weigel 430

Ecumenism. Gustave Weigel 555

He Saved Us From Scandal: John Markoe, S.J. Robert T. Reilly 361

How To Get Rid of History. John W. O'Malley 394

Ignatian Survey: 1967. Robert C. Collins (ed.) 384

Ignatius' Own Legislation on Prayer. Miguel A. Fiorito 149

Infancy Narratives and the Spiritual Exercises, The. Michael Petty 241

Intellectual Life, The. Gustave Weigel 517

Jesuits and the Interracial Apostolate. Richard A. Blake (ed.); Contributors: Peter Arrupe, Albert P. Bartlett, Anthony Croce, Edward G. Winner, Philip S. Hurley, Robert E. McEwen, Richard T. McSorley, Leo J. Gafney, John Courtney Murray 289

Jesuits and Social Change. Peter Arrupe 67

Jesuits Go Home: the Anti-Jesuit Movement in the United States, 1830–1860. Donald F. Crosby 225

Letters to Sr. Jeremy. Gustave Weigel 590

Man For Others: Reflections on Gustave Weigel. Walter J. Burghardt 604

Nature of the Church, The. Gustave Weigel 484

Preaching the Word. Gustave Weigel 449

Religion and Involvement in Society. Gustave Weigel 568

Santa Clara Conference: Reflections and Reminiscence, The. Justin J. Kelly 367

Thoughts on Latin America. Gustave Weigel 456

Vatican Council. Gustave Weigel 597

CONTRIBUTORS

Arrupe, Peter. Jesuits and Social Change . . . 67

Blake, Richard A. (ed.) Jesuits and the Interracial Apostolate . . . 289

Brodrick, James. An Address at Bellarmine College . . . 57

Burghardt, Walter J. Man for Others: Reflections on Gustave Weigel . . . 604

Collins, Robert C. (ed.) Ignatian Survey: 1967 . . . 384

Costello, Charles P. Calcutta, Cassocks, and Cheroots . . . 80

Crosby, Donald F. Jesuits Go Home: the Anti-Jesuit Movement in the United States, 1830–1860 . . . 225

Curran, Francis X. Archbishop Hughes and the Jesuits . . . 5

Fiorito, Miguel A. Ignatius' Own Legislation on Prayer . . . 149

Kelly, Justin J. The Santa Clara Conference: Reflections and Reminiscence . . . 367

Meissner, William A. The Concept of Authority . . . 252

O'Malley, John W. How To Get Rid of History . . . 394

Petty, Michael A. The Infancy Narratives and the Spiritual Exercises . . . 241

Reilly, Robert T. He Saved Us From Scandal: John Markoe, S.J. 361

Weigel, Gustave. The Early Years . . . 430

———. Preaching the Word . . . 449

———. Thoughts on Latin America . . . 456

———. The Nature of the Church . . . 484

———. The Intellectual Life . . . 517

———. Church and State . . . 540

———. Ecumenism . . . 555

———. Religion and Involvement in Society . . . 568

———. Letters to Sr. Jeremy . . . 590

———. Vatican Council . . . 597

BOOK REVIEWS

Danielou, Jean. *Prayer As a Political Problem.* New York: Sheed and Ward, 1967, (Patrick J. Ryan) 271

Evoy, S.J., John J. and Van F. Christoph, S.J. *The Real Woman in Religious Life.* New York: Sheed and Ward, 1967. (Sr. Sharon Feyen, S.D.S.) 279

L'Heureux, S.J. John. Picnic in Babylon. New York: Macmillan, 1967. (Sr. Maura, S.S.N.D., Edwin D. Cuffe, G. Michael McCrossin) 121

McNaspy, S.J., Clement J. *Change Not Changes . . . New Directions in Religious Life and Priesthood.* New York: Paulist Press, 1968. (Francis P. Valentino) 417

Noon, S.J., William T. *Poetry and Prayer.* New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1967. (Robert R. Boyle) 274

O'Gara, James (ed.). *The Postconciliar Parish.* New York: P.J. Kenedy and Sons, 1967. (Francis J. Tierney) 413

Ruether, Rosemary. *The Church Against Itself.* New York: Herder and Herder. (Joseph F. Roccasalvo) 420

Selected Readings: Teilhard de Chardin. (Brian O. McDermott) 134

von Balthasar, Hans Urs. *A Theological Anthropology.* New York: Sheed and Ward, 1967. (James J. DiGiacomo) 269

STRIPPENBECK BOOKBINDERY
JUL 8 1971